

**ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD  
AGUA CALIENTE PARK  
12325 E. ROGER ROAD  
TUCSON, AZ  
NOVEMBER 18, 2004  
MINUTES**

**Board Members Present:**

John Hays, Chairman  
Elizabeth Stewart  
William Porter  
Gabriel Gonzales-Beechum  
Mark Winkleman

**Board Members Absent:**

William Cordasco  
Janice Chilton

**Staff Present:**

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director  
Jay Ream, Assistant Director, Parks  
Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director, Partnerships and External Affairs  
Mark Siegwarth, Assistant Director, Administration  
Debi Busser, Executive Secretary  
Charles Eatherly, Acting Chief, Resources Management  
Janet Hawks, Chief of Parks  
Ray Warriner  
Elizabeth Krug, Chief of Research and Marketing  
Audra Beyer, Research and Marketing  
Rick Toomey, Cave Expert, Kartchner Caverns State Parks

**Attorney General's Office:**

Joy Hernbrode, Assistant Attorney General

**A. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL**

Chairman Hays called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

**B. INTRODUCTIONS**

The Board and Executive Staff introduced themselves. Chairman Hays noted that anyone wishing to address the Board through the course of this meeting needed to complete a Speaker's form and give it to the secretary.

**C. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No members of the public present wished to address the Board at this time.

**D. CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Approve Minutes of July 22, 2004 State Parks Board Meeting
2. Approve Minutes of September 23, 2004 State Parks Board Meeting
3. Approve Minutes of Executive Session held September 23, 2004

4. **Consider Extending the Project End Date for the City of Prescott State Lake Improvement Fund Project #780004, Willow/Watson Lakes Development** – Staff recommends extending the project end date by 12 months to November 30, 2005 for the City of Prescott State Lake Improvement Fund Project #780004, Willow/Watson Lakes Development.
5. **Consider Extending the Project end Date for the Maricopa County Trails Heritage Fund Project #689905, Goat Camp Trail Extension/Acquisition** – Staff recommends extending the project end date by 12 months to October 22, 2005 for the Trails Heritage Fund Project #689905, Goat Camp Trail Extension/Acquisition.
6. **Consider Extending the Project End Date for the Mohave County State Lake Improvement Fund Project #789901, Davis Camp Improvements** – Staff recommends extending the project end date by 12 months to December 7, 2005 for the Mohave County State Lake Improvement Fund Project #789901, Davis Camp Improvements.
7. **Consider Extending the Project End Date for the Mohave County State Lake Improvement Fund Project #780001, Davis Camp Improvements** – Staff recommends extending the project end date by 12 months to December 18, 2005 for the Mohave County State Lake Improvement Fund Project #780001, Davis Camp Improvements.
8. **Consider Extending the Project End Date for the Florence Preservation Foundation Historic Preservation Fund Project #640003 Silver King/Florence Hotel Stabilization** – Staff recommends extending the project end date by two years to November 27, 2006 for the Heritage Preservation Heritage Fund Grant Project #640003 – Florence Preservation Foundation for the Silver King/Florence Hotel Stabilization.
9. **Consider Request for a Funding Adjustment and Extension of the Project End Date for the St. David School District Historic Preservation Fund Project #640301, Rehabilitation of the 1938 St. David School Building** – Staff does not recommend the approval of a funding adjustment to the St. David School District for the Rehabilitation of the 1938 St. David School due to the lack of funding available.
10. **Consider Obligating Recreational Trails Program Funds** – Staff requests Arizona State Parks Board approval to re-obligate \$73,968 in FFY 1997 motorized portion RTP funds and \$238,519 in FFY 1998 motorized portion RTP funds to fund public access, signage, and OHV mitigation projects through an interagency agreement with the Arizona Game and Fish Department.

**Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move the approval of the Consent Agenda with the exception of Item #9. Ms. Stewart seconded the motion.

Mr. Beechum noted that due to a conflict of interest regarding Consent Agenda Item #8, he would abstain from voting on that Item.

The motion carried unanimously, with Mr. Beechum abstaining from voting on Consent Agenda Item #8.

Chairman Hays opened discussion on Consent Agenda Item #9, Request for a Funding Adjustment and Extension of the Project End Date for the St. David School District Historic Preservation Fund Project #640301, Rehabilitation of the 1938 St. David School Building.

Ms. Sue Kartchner, representing the St. David School District, addressed the Board. Ms. Kartchner stated she was present at this meeting with regard to the St. David School's Heritage Fund grant for historic buildings for the St. David Schools.

Ms. Kartchner stated that the building was built in 1938 by a prominent architect and mayor of Tucson. The small town of St. David is the oldest continuously-occupied settlement in Cochise County. The school building is the last remaining public building in that community, used heavily by the school and by the community. It has six classrooms and a large auditorium.

Ms. Kartchner stated that she served as President of the School Board there as well as a member of the Heritage Society. St. David is a small, rural community. There are not a lot of funds available; they are very limited by the district for restoration of this building. The School Facilities Board recommended demolition. The community rallied and did a building conditions assessment that said this is a great building. No school children remain in this building as of last summer because of the new facility that was built. That new facility, however, does not have an auditorium.

Ms. Kartchner stated that the community has heavily supported this project (at a level of 70%). She distributed information to the Board containing information on the building.

Ms. Kartchner noted that the School Facilities Board removed the building from their rolls. They applied for and received a Heritage Fund grant. They went to bid twice. With the extreme rise in construction costs they have not been able to come to a contract agreement within the budget. In fact, the low bidder remains at 52% over budget. The low bidder has stayed with them for about two months as they tried to do some value engineering and as they attempt today to get some additional funding from the Parks Board. The low bidder is willing to hold on with the town.

Ms. Kartchner stated that they have partnered with the University of Arizona (UA) and have found the original blueprints for the building in the archives of the UA. The UA will also assist with future architectural work.

Ms. Kartchner stated that their request has two parts. First, they propose to add an additional \$11,434 (half from the school district and half from the community). This would raise their match from \$46,934 to \$58,368. Second, they request that the participant match level (originally awarded on a 50/50 basis) change to 40/60. When they originally applied for the grant they were awarded the highest number of points in that grant cycle (94 points out of a possible 100). Had they applied at the 40/60 level they still would have received the highest number of points for that year. With the additional \$11,000 they would like to put in, and by changing the 50/50 match to a 40/60, they can accomplish the project.

Ms. Kartchner stated that the project involves critical re-roofing. She presented photographs of the auditorium and photographs showing some of the problems with the roof. Their request essentially comes down to an additional \$40,617. They believe they can get the project done for a little less than that. They believe this would be reasonable after going to bid twice. The roof urgently needs work. The project also includes necessary structural stiffening and extra supports. While they continue to get public support, there is not a lot of money in the community. They believe that with their request they could accomplish the project and the community will continue to support it. There are additional phases to be completed before children can return to that building.

Ms. Kartchner stated that they recognize that the Advisory Committee has recommended not approving this request. They met with the committee and HPAC were very supportive. She feels they wish they could support this request. If nothing else, they are asking for a statement of approval or an approval contingent on funds becoming available in the next cycle.

Mr. Ziemann noted that he attended the HPAC meeting. HPAC would echo Ms. Kartchner's statements. They are very supportive of this project; unfortunately, HPAC do not have \$45,000 in the fund to give. All the money has been granted.

Ms. Stewart noted that not only has the Board granted all of the available money, but at the last Board meeting the Board said that if any money was returned it is to go to another project that couldn't be fully funded. She noted that a new policy on that grant was adopted and the matching was changed to a minimum of 60% cash. She was not particularly in favor of that change, but the Chairman of HPAC gave a presentation where he discussed how strongly HPAC felt that it needed to be done. She would hesitate to approve this request from the standpoint that, number one, the Board has already obligated money it doesn't have and, number two, this request would be contrary to the new policy. She added that, third, she is very concerned about setting a precedent where there is a request for a substantial amendment that almost makes it a new project. She is concerned about the precedent that would establish. She would prefer to see another application. She feels this is an excellent project.

Chairman Hays noted that there is no reason they could not apply again next year. They could do what they can with what they have and come back.

Ms. Kartchner responded that they are working on some possibilities of trying to change the project a bit. She understood, when they first applied, that an applicant could be awarded a maximum of three different grants.

Ms. Stewart stated that she was unaware of that. There may be a limit as to how many grants can be pending at one time.

Mr. Ziemann stated that the only limitation he is aware of is the amount of money granted but not how many grants can be awarded.

Ms. Stewart suggested that there may be a way to try to have the scope changed so they can do slightly less and then come back for a grant on the remaining work.

Mr. Ziemann noted that this project scored very high. While everyone is very supportive of this project and wants to see it accomplished, he believes the Board needs

to leave this one in place, do the best we can with it, and encourage them to come back for a supplemental grant.

Mr. Travous reminded the Board that we are under a contractual obligation when the grant is signed. Staff's encouragement does not mean the contractual responsibility is waived.

Ms. Kartchner noted that their contract states that they need to have construction completed by the first week in June 2005. They did not specifically put in a request for extension of the end date. She noticed that the Agenda has that kind of request listed. She asked if it would be expedient for them to request an extension at this time.

Ms. Stewart responded that staff can grant an extension. It only comes before the Board if it is a second request for extension. The first request can be worked out with staff.

### **Board Action**

Mr. Porter: In relation to Consent Agenda Item #9, I move to disapprove a funding adjustment for the St. David School District Historic Preservation Fund Project #640301 due to a lack of funding.

Ms. Stewart seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Hays returned to Agenda Item C.

### **C. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Jim Shelly, Cachet Homes/Cross Creek Ranch, addressed the Board. He is here representing Cross Creek Ranch Community Association. Cross Creek Ranch is a 217-acre parcel of ground in Yavapai County adjacent to and a neighbor of Red Rock State Park. They share the common boundary of Oak Creek to the north side of their property and Red Rock State Park is their eastern boundary (they are the park's western boundary).

Mr. Shelly stated that they purchased the property and developed the community into an 84-lot 2-acre community. As such, they created a Home Owners Association (HOA) – Cross Creek Ranch Community Association – to manage the affairs of the community. They are sold out and will close Escrow very soon. Therefore, there will no longer be participation from the community association; it will be taken over by the individual lot owners within Cross Creek Ranch.

Mr. Shelly stated that there are a number of items that they worked on with staff over the last two or three years because of being neighbors and common property owners. He wanted to bring a couple of those items to the Board's attention this morning and and hoped for the Board's direction to staff to document their working relationship.

Mr. Shelly stated that one issue is the Armejo Ditch. The Armejo Ditch is approximately 2 miles long, and the irrigation ditch was dug by the Armejo family in the early 1900s. It has historically been maintained by the owners of Cross Creek Ranch because it is the end user of the 2-mile long irrigation ditch. Approximately 1 mile is on Cross Creek Ranch and 1 mile is further upstream on Red Rock State Park (Red Rock). The headwaters of the irrigation ditch are Oak Creek, just off the property of Red Rock. They would like to document the verbal agreement, as they move out of the picture and the

Community Association takes over, for the association to continue maintenance obligations over that ditch.

Mr. Shelly noted that, in addition to the Armejo Ditch, there was an agreement to invite the Park Managers to the HOA annual meetings so that as neighbors they can continue those lines of communications. If there are problems that the Park Manager has on those lots by the park, it provides an open forum to address those concerns. Likewise, if the lot owners within the Community Association have concerns or issues with Red Rock, they have a forum to address those issues.

Mr. Shelly noted that the last issue is that of control of pedestrian access. The common boundary has a number of hiking trails associated with both the park and the trail system that they created within the Cross Creek Community. They agree in concept that the pedestrian access should be limited to Red Rock and it should be limited to Cross Creek Ranch to benefit both property owners.

Mr. Shelly stated that the above are the three main points of an agreement they would like to bring before the Board. His purpose for being present at this meeting is to make the Board aware of those issues.

Ms. Stewart noted that the Board is tentatively planning to be in the Verde Valley for their January meeting. She suggested that that would be a good time for discussion on this issue.

Chairman Hays then moved to Agenda Item G.

## **G. PARTNERSHIPS AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

### **1. Section Report**

#### Update on Diamondbacks Marketing

Mr. Ziemann gave a PowerPoint presentation on marketing efforts with the Diamondbacks (D-Backs). He introduced Mr. Tim Emory, the agency's contact at the Diamondbacks. Mr. Emory needed to get back to Phoenix and that is why this Agenda Item was moved forward.

Mr. Ziemann reported that the Board raised a number of questions in July during the budget meeting regarding the money being spent in our marketing relationship with the D-Backs and what staff are trying to accomplish. A copy of the slides was distributed to the Board.

Mr. Ziemann reported that the fact of the matter is that Arizona State Parks (ASP) is forced to advertise. Very little advertising was done in the past. ASP needs to advertise for two primary purposes: 1) the Board is asking staff to raise the awareness of the agency throughout the population of the state and 2) the budget is dependent upon the Enhancement Fund and the revenues it generates. Over the past five years revenues have continued to climb, and we have become more and more reliant on these revenues as other state funding dries up.

Mr. Ziemann noted that marketing targets and constraints have been discussed from time to time with the Board over the past couple of years. The agency targets families. The typical park visitor is the family – groups of people coming to the parks. Staff want to target Maricopa County because the agency has less visibility there. A lot of

marketing can be done in Safford for Roper Lake, but it only goes so far in raising awareness of the agency in general and generating revenues that we need to make the budget work. The agency really needs to target Maricopa County. The Board and staff also want to target the Hispanic community.

Mr. Ziemann reported that one constraint is that the Research and Marketing Section has a very limited budget - \$350,000 - to implement the marketing plan this year. That is almost double from years past. In the past the Marketing budget was about \$200,000. The additional \$150,000 was added into this year's budget in an effort to make the numbers for Project 11 and do some other things. A critical factor, if one is going to target Maricopa County, is that marketing there is almost prohibitively expensive.

Mr. Ziemann noted that if the agency were to advertise on radio station KTAR, the radio spots would cost \$350,000 (about \$350 each) and would reach about 38,000 people. To reach a similar number of local Arizonans as we reach through our efforts with the D-Backs, staff would need to run nearly 700 spots on KTAR at a cost of approximately \$140,000. The cost for a 30-second TV spot on Channel 3 in Phoenix during the morning news hour would cost about \$700, not including the cost of producing the advertisement. Based upon their viewership, to reach as many people as we currently reach just in Phoenix through our efforts with the D-Backs, we would need to run about 250 spots, at a cost of approximately \$170,000. A full-page ad in the *Arizona Republic* costs \$45,000. To reach a similar number of people as is being reached with the D-Backs, we would need to have about 53 ads at a cost of \$1.3 million.

Mr. Ziemann addressed the issue of why staff believe the D-Backs are a good fit with ASP. Essentially, the demographics of the two organizations are very similar. The D-Backs' fan base and the people who come to our parks are remarkably similar as far as targeting the college-educated; annual household income is very similar. The D-Backs are also attractive because they reach some of those targets staff have referenced: 87% live in Maricopa County; they have a large Hispanic population who are D-Backs fans we can reach as well.

Mr. Ziemann reported that for the past year the marketing contract with the D-Backs was \$50,000. The question is what did ASP receive for that money. Approximately \$13,000 of that \$50,000 goes to support the Arizona D-Backs Training Centers. These are youth baseball and girls' softball camps held throughout the state. The number of camps and campers has expanded over the last 4 or 5 years. At the end of this year there will be about 3,000 kids who will have gone through these camps. Our logo appears at the camps; our logo is on materials that are displayed there; the camp T-shirt includes our logo; and the campers receive a ditty bag that also includes things we distribute, including the agency brochure.

Mr. Ziemann noted that a question was asked at the July meeting about the kids who can't afford to go to the camp. The D-Backs will give nearly \$9,000 in camp scholarships this year to children who can't afford the camps. They have never turned a child away who wanted to go to one of these camps.

Mr. Ziemann reported that ASP receives a half-page ad in the D-Backs magazine that is sold at the ballpark and distributed in news counters throughout the state. It is the second highest circulation of any monthly magazine in the state. Staff changes the ad about three times a year.

Mr. Emory added that this magazine goes directly to every season ticketholder – ASP's true core. These people make enough money to afford season tickets and are true representatives of the demographics. There are about 8,000 season ticketholders, and about 2,000 additional copies of the magazine are sold at the game. They try to get this magazine out to as many people as possible for branding for their partners. There is a pocket of fans in Nebraska who also receive this magazine.

Mr. Ziemann reported that another benefit with the D-Backs is the coupons. The Diamondbackers are a group of fans who regularly attend the games. They receive a free card and put it into an ATM machine when they go to the game. The ATM spits out three or four coupons that can be used in the team shop, restaurants in the ballpark, etc. ASP distributed six series of these coupons totaling about 10,000 coupons during the year. ASP is reimbursed for 2 for 1 visits to the parks.

Mr. Emory noted that there are about 42,000 very active people in that program.

Mr. Porter asked how many of those coupons actually were used at our parks.

Ms. Krug responded that those numbers are tracked, but she did not have that number with her today.

Mr. Ziemann added that the figures for past years are available at the office, but not for this year.

Ms. Stewart asked for a ballpark percentage of redeemed coupons handed out.

Ms. Krug responded that the average number of coupons returned is 2.5%.

Ms. Stewart asked if the 2.5% is on all coupons or specifically D-Back coupons redeemed.

Ms. Krug responded that it is on other coupons. She does not have the specific information on the D-Back coupons with her today.

Ms. Stewart asked if the return on these coupons could be lower or higher.

Ms. Krug responded that staff do not know. She noted that a 10% return is very high; 5% is standard.

Ms. Stewart asked if staff keep track of this information.

Ms. Krug responded that staff do keep track, but that she did not have that information with her today.

Mr. Ziemann noted that as the new year approached, staff considered what they specifically wanted to do with the D-Backs; there were other options available to the agency (Plaza Night, etc.). He recalls discussing the coupons and thinking that this program was a success; that we were getting a successful rate of return on the coupons. That is why staff decided to retain this strategy. We've done this for the past two or three years. It was his sense that, statistically, it was something we wanted to continue.

Ms. Stewart asked if there would be a higher rate of return if, for instance, coupons were given out to people at one park for another park.

Mr. Emory noted that ASP does not actually pay for this. It is what is known as an added value. ASP essentially pays for the sign. As an example, the D-Backs charged



other companies \$75,000 last year to have the same rotating sign that ASP paid, roughly \$37,000 for. It was such a success that it will be \$100,000 this year. Again, ASP's total partnership was \$50,000.

Mr. Ziemann added that the sign is known as a "rotator". He referred to a slide showing what the sign looked like. The sign appears behind the batter. This is, essentially, what ASP is paying for. If \$13,000 of the budgeted \$50,000 went in support of the youth camps, then the remaining \$37,000 went into the sign. They charged other people \$75,000 for this sign. The large APS signs are \$250,000 per year.

Ms. Stewart asked if staff brought the statistics on the number of hits on the website just after showing the sign.

Mr. Ziemann responded that, as he told the Board in Flagstaff in July, the tracking system that records hits to the website, unfortunately, was down for two or three months. Staff are still compiling a lot of those numbers.

Mr. Emory added that a lot of other clients have reported getting up to 300 hits while their sign is up during the game. He believes that ASP is a little more attractive than that.

Mr. Ziemann stated that the critical number here is that just within the Phoenix market about 16.5 million people saw that sign while watching the Diamondback games on TV. Staff were very happy about the visibility of the sign when sitting in the ballpark. He had assumed that it would just be a blue screen. The sign actually rotates and has fairly good visibility in the ballpark. In addition, because of out-of-state coverage with other teams showing the D-Backs games ASP received in excess of 10 million additional impressions. We are talking about nearly 30 million fans seeing the sign.

Mr. Emory explained that when the games were in Phoenix, the TV feed was going back to New York when they played the Giants. Because they really can't help but see that sign, more than 700,000 people in New York were exposed to it. It literally went country-wide.

Mr. Ziemann noted that, in the long term, perhaps even more importantly we have been able to establish a partnership with the D-Backs that helped ASP in countless ways. They were instrumental in the Big Room opening last year. A significant amount of money was raised (\$50,000) through Diamondback Charities. They ran commercials and talked about Kartchner Caverns State Park (KCSP) during the broadcasts for about six weeks or so. That was a tremendous boon for the agency and for Diamondback Charities.

Mr. Porter asked if staff have any records or statistics as to what was generated insofar as visitation reaction.

Mr. Ziemann responded that staff know that 500 people were willing to pay \$250 each to go through the Big Room at KCSP. Those tickets were sold in a tremendously short period of time. The cave was attractive, and it sold out before the advertising ran out.

Mr. Ziemann noted that the D-Backs are being very helpful with Ms. Statler's efforts with the ASP Foundation's efforts. Staff hope that that support continues to grow.

Mr. Emory noted that the Board has said the Hispanic market is key. It is a key to all of us. About 25% of Phoenix is Hispanic. The Hispanic community is watching. The D-Backs run their games in SAP that turns English into Spanish while watching the game. As Hispanics are watching the game in Phoenix, they also see the sign as well. Baseball is huge in the Hispanic community. It is a good place to effectively hit. He noted that the \$13,000 that goes to Diamondback Charities actually fuels their training centers. The D-Backs organization does not see any of that money. They return \$0.93 of every \$1.00 they take in. The D-Backs are greatly discounting this marketing program to ASP because it is a governmental agency. With corporate sponsors such as Budweiser, it is good karma to have an entity like ASP with them. He believes their fans appreciate that. He noted that newspaper ads at \$1.3 million is high.

Mr. Porter suggested that presupposes that the agency would engage in that kind of newspaper, radio, or TV advertising. He quite frankly did not believe the Board would do that. It is his opinion that that kind of generic advertising is marvelous if one has competitors who are, say, going to drink beer or softdrinks. The idea is to plant that trademark in their minds so when they go to the store and see that product, they buy it. That is the whole idea of that kind of advertising. However, generic advertising for ASP doesn't really help all that much due to the fact that ASP really doesn't have another big competitor. Actually, there is a competitor who everyone thinks ASP is – the National Park Service. If a poll was run after people saw the sign in the park as to who ASP is, they will probably respond that we are the people who operate the Grand Canyon. Polls that staff have run show that there is a large confusion factor where people think ASP runs the Grand Canyon.

Mr. Porter stated that he had hoped to see today, and still hopes to see, some correlation between the actual hits generated on the website from advertising at the games. If, in fact, there is a significant correlation there, it will probably impact his view as to whether or not this marketing effort is useful. While it may expose the agency to the Hispanic population, he questions whether it does anything besides flashing our name and website. While he knows he sounds fairly negative, he does not mean it that way. The Board has a very limited budget, and he is extremely concerned about whether this effort accomplishes what needs to be done. He does not know the answer because the only way to measure is going to be to see whether we are getting a measurable reaction that would suggest that it is getting people to actually go to the website where they can then get information that, while we don't run the Grand Canyon, we certainly do run KCSP.

Mr. Emory responded that, regarding Mr. Porter's first concern, Budweiser holds 65% of the market share. They don't need to advertise in Phoenix. Bud and Bud Light are the most popular brands at the ballpark. They still spend about \$65 million in advertising. People really do forget. He suggested including a statement on the sign that says to go to the website for a coupon.

Mr. Travous asked if ASP could have more than one message throughout the year on the sign.

Mr. Emory responded that they would be willing to allow changes.

Mr. Travous suggested adding to the logo something like, "Arizona State Parks reminds you to conserve water." Then alternate with something like, "Arizona State Parks

reminds you to conserve energy.” Those are things he knows the Governor is very high on right now. It would be a supplement.

Mr. Ziemann added that more people do recognize ASP now because of the success of KSCP and they recognize the excellence of KCSP. When they go to KCSP they see the tree/cactus/water logo. There is an understanding and association with the agency. Now we are trying to say, “See this logo – there’s lots of other things we do as well and they are as equally excellent as KCSP.”

Mr. Ziemann noted that the fact of the matter is that we need to market in Maricopa County. There are very few ways to effectively do that. It is through the radio, newspapers, or TV. There are limited ways to market dollars and make some kind of impact. With this marketing effort, a limited amount of money reaches 30 million people.

Ms. Stewart stated her concern about the correlation. She would like to see the statistics the Board asked for. She would like to know what percentage of coupons actually get redeemed as opposed to other programs where coupons are distributed. She doesn’t see any relevance on the figures of the cost of a full-page ad between that and what we’re doing here because she can’t envision that we would do a full-page ad. It seems to her that the kind of advertising we need to do is that which explains who we are. Rather than run just a logo and a website for a brand where it was clear from our own surveys that people believe we run parks that we don’t, she would prefer to see the marketing dollars spent on a few TV ads that show pictures of some of the parks or some short radio spots. She believes the ads that were run in the newspaper advertising the cabins and yurts were excellent. They were small ads, and obviously did not cost \$25,000 a pop. She is just not sure the sign is getting people to go to the parks. People first have to go to the website. If they think we’re someone else, it may make them think they ought to visit the Grand Canyon rather than visit our website and go to one of our parks. She is also concerned about the perception of ASP making this kind of expenditure with the legislature. Last year \$50,000 was 25% of the agency’s marketing budget. She doesn’t have as much problem with doing it as a one-time thing. It appears to her that we need to try other things.

Ms. Stewart added that, while the D-Backs Camp is a very nice thing to do, she is not sure that we, as a state agency, can afford to make a \$13,000 donation to something that is not directly related to people coming to the parks. Showing our logo at these camps when we don’t have any identification already established won’t make people go to parks they aren’t already familiar with. She doesn’t believe it’s solving our problem. She is very concerned that, even with the increase in budget, it’s still 1/7 of the total Marketing budget. If this was designed so that the \$13,000 was a joint thing where the youth were brought to some of the parks to enjoy the parks, then that would make some sense. She is hesitant as a steward of the public’s funds to authorize this kind of expenditure.

Mr. Travous responded that this issue will be placed on the January Agenda as an Action Item for the Board to vote up or down.

Ms. Stewart stated that she is ready to vote today.

Mr. Porter stated that he is not ready to vote today. He wants to see the figures. He thought the figures would be provided before today.

Mr. Travous responded that one way to ascertain this effort's success is the dollars spent per hits received. The real common denominator is for each time the ad is presented how many people see it and what are you getting for your dollar. That is information staff have not given the Board. The effectiveness, however, is a different story. The question the Board will have to ask themselves is are we in the game of telling people who we are or are we still in the process of telling people that we are. He believes that this is a discussion the Board ought to have in January.

Mr. Porter reiterated his desire to see those figures.

Mr. Emory noted that he believes the branding the agency is getting outside of Arizona is probably outstanding. The Arizona Office of Tourism is an outstanding partner. They have told him how important it is in Chicago, Minneapolis, and all those places from where people come and are actually watching their teams play here to see ASP. Some of those people get curious and since they are Arizona they may pop down to the Grand Canyon. However, that's not what they'll see on the website – they will see other places to go. Doing 30-40 radio spots will quickly eat up the marketing budget. As was shown in the presentation, we are getting about 38,000 people as opposed to 340,000 people on the average of the D-Backs broadcasts.

Mr. Porter responded that, if this is being effective, then it is cheap. He is not sure that it is effective.

Mr. Emory noted that he is going by what other clients have told him they get from the sign. They do see the hits.

Chairman Hays stated that the Board should await more information from staff as requested by the Board. The Board can take this issue up again in January.

Chairman Hays recessed the meeting at 11:05 a.m. Mr. Winkleman left the meeting at this point.

Chairman Hays reconvened the meeting at 11:18 a.m. A quorum was present to conduct business.

## **E. BOARD ACTION ITEMS**

- 1. Consider Approving the Arizona Trails 2005 Plan** – Staff recommends approval of the Arizona Trails 2005 Plan.

Ms. Stewart noted that she read through the Plan and was very impressed with all of the work that was done. It would be helpful to her as a Board member for staff to point out anything staff found that was unexpected or significant that the Board should be aware of. She read all of the findings and recommendations, but it's hard for her to put it into the context of what staff might have expected.

Ms. McVay responded that there was nothing unexpected. There are only a handful of recommendations. Sometimes the order of priority changes. The only thing new this year is that staff found from almost everyone across the state, from the users to the land managers, that they wanted more money and funding to go toward coordinated

volunteerism. The Planning and Trails staff worked very closely with the Grants staff in an effort to ensure that the Trails Grant Criteria reflects what was found.

Ms. Stewart asked, based on that statement, if staff anticipate shifts in the criteria.

Ms. McVay responded affirmatively. There are plans to restructure the program to ensure that the points go to the real trail needs of the state.

Ms. Stewart asked where those shifts will occur.

Ms. McVay responded that more points will go to maintenance.

Ms. Stewart stated that this Plan was an excellent job by staff.

Mr. Porter noted that consistently the highest area of concern expressed in the various polls and surveys was litter. He asked if that was better or worse this year as far as being on everyone's list.

Ms. McVay responded that it is almost always a top issue.

### **Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move to approve the Arizona Trails 2005 Plan.

Mr. Beechum seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. McVay noted that the Chairman from ASCOT was present and requested the Board hear the ASCOT presentation before proceeding to the next Agenda Item.

## **I. PARKS**

### **1. Section Report**

#### **Update from ASCOT**

Ms. Kate Bradley, Chairman, ASCOT, addressed the Board. She recognized members of ASCOT who were present at the meeting (Mike Snodgrass, Fred Pfeifer, and Dan Gruber). She thanked the Board for their support of the Arizona Trails 2005 Plan. She noted that ASCOT uses that Plan. Some of the actions ASCOT takes on directly relates to the six non-motorized recommendations from that Plan. Her purpose for being present is to give the Board some highlights of what ASCOT is doing.

Ms. Bradley reported that several years ago ASCOT asked trail users to assess the condition of trails and then took that information back to the trail managers to give them a bird's eye view of how their trails are perceived by users. ASCOT reviewed the recommendations of those trails to be included in the state Trails system. They take their responsibility very seriously to maintain a high standard in the system of more than 600 trails. It is an exciting process.

Ms. Bradley reported that ASCOT recently designed and created a State Trails System identification sign. They can now put a brand name on the more than 600 trails in the system and identify them as part of the State Trails System.

Ms. Stewart asked what the criteria is to be included in the trails system.

Ms. Bradley responded that there must be a managing entity.

Ms. McVay added that the criteria is broken down among the various types of trails (urban, historic, etc.). Each type of trail has its own criteria.

Ms. Bradley reported that ASCOT includes a very diverse representation including the land management agencies and major user groups in the state. Several partnerships have been formed as a result of their affiliation on ASCOT to address the issue of comprehensive planning in the 2005 Plan. It is that networking within ASCOT that provides the opportunity for counties and communities to approach the effort of comprehensive trail planning. It is particularly exciting in the rural communities where they don't have staff or the available funds for consultants to do that work for them.

Ms. Bradley reported that the Arizona Trails Guide has been updated and is being printed. It provides excellent maps of the trails in the system and provides critical information for the trails users.

Ms. Bradley reported that the ASCOT Workshop has come to be relied upon by the trails community to come together to discuss their trails issues and move those issues forward in the state. It has turned out to be a very useful educational tool.

Ms. Bradley reported that, in addition to those activities, ASCOT also plays a key role in the coordination of National Trails Day in the state. In 2001 ASCOT was awarded the highest honor from the American Hiking Society for their activities and how they were organized in the state. Last year they had 70 events, up from 50 the previous year. They introduced a new concept to the American Hiking Society about National Trails Day. Since it falls during a very hot time of the year in Arizona, they suggested a National Trails Season that begins in April and concludes on National Trails Day. They liked the idea. There was such an increase in events that they now want to take it into the other southern states that are having the same issue.

Ms. Bradley reported that the Historic Trails Subcommittee finalized the update of the Historic Trails Map and brochure. This is a tool to help raise the awareness of the cultural heritage in the state and the importance of those trails in the history of the state. ASCOT really has an opportunity to leverage partnerships and that's what they are good at. This was a collaboration of the historians in the state as well as the trails community.

Ms. Bradley reported that the trails community is now partnering very strongly with the Health community as we all begin to address the issues of obesity and the more sedentary lifestyle of our culture.

Ms. Bradley reported that ASCOT does some fun and necessary outreach. They will do a presentation to the Growing Smarter Oversight Committee so that as they look at growth and development in the state, they also become aware of ASCOT and trails and the vital role trails and open space play in developing our communities and providing a higher quality of life.

Ms. Bradley reported that ASCOT made contact with the entire national delegation in reference to the Arizona Trail's attempt at a national state trails designation. They received wonderful feedback from Congressman Pasteur about his support and his recognition of ASCOT.

Ms. Bradley stated that it was her pleasure to be a part of ASCOT, to serve on ASCOT, work with the dedicated ASP staff, and be of service to the State Parks Board. She thanked the Board for their time and their support of ASCOT.

Mr. Porter stated that, except for the actual operation of our state parks, ASCOT really benefits the people of this state in many ways. He believes it benefits a tremendous number of people – constituents if you will – of the state. He personally believes this is one of the most valuable things the Board does.

Ms. Stewart stated that she has been very impressed since joining the Board with what ASCOT has done. This really is a working committee. She had the opportunity to attend a couple of their meetings and the workshop this past year. The number of projects and the complexity of some monumental undertakings are amazing. Any one of these projects (the Historic Trails Map, updating the State Trails System Guide, conducting the Workshop, etc.,) would have been a major accomplishment for any committee. To have done five or six of these projects is reflective of how important this is to the citizens of the state. The Trails Plan indicated that 67% or so of the people actually use trails. She wished we could get 67% of the people in this state to actually regularly use our state parks. It really shows where people's priorities are. One only has to look at the Sunday paper to see that there has been that shift from advertising the golf courses and tennis courts to saying things are near trails and open space. That's what people want. The work that ASCOT does is not something the agency would be able to do. The Board really relies on the volunteers. There has been tremendous leadership with Ms. Bradley (and Mr. Winfield from the Parks Service and Tom Fitzgerald from the City of Phoenix before), and our very capable staff, Ms. McVay, who keeps things headed in the right direction. It is a lot of work for one staff person to keep up with this committee that is producing all of these products.

Mr. Porter added that there is a very large number of people who obviously have an interest in trails. He asked what can be done to try to tap into that interest and encourage people to come to state parks that are reasonably close to some of these trails. For example, people hike the Anza Trail. Do they find things at the trailheads that suggest to them that there is a state park just a snail's breath from where they will be walking.

Mr. Travous responded that the agency's logo is on all of their trails and will be on all of the trailheads. It gets back to what the agency is organizationally. If part of the Mission is, "... both in our parks and through our partners ..." that alone says what we are trying to do in our 30 parks.

Mr. Porter responded that it seems that, logically, the kinds of people who will be out there on those trails probably are the kinds of people who might also be interested in our parks, especially those parks that are close to some of these trails. They may very well be enticed into coming to those parks.

Ms. Stewart added that perhaps we should begin to focus advertising of our parks as gateways to the trails. When one looks at a lot of our parks, the actual amount of land ASP has is relatively small. But, for instance, Lost Dutchman and Catalina State Parks are both gateways to tremendous hiking areas. That's why a lot of people go to those parks. Perhaps that is something to consider. The Lost Kiln Trail was an excellent idea because it connects one of our parks to another public land.

Mr. Travous asked ASCOT to discuss how they can assist in advertising our state parks at their next meeting.

Ms. Stewart asked when the Historic Parks Map will be ready.

Ms. McVay responded that it is ready. It is in line for a printing bid. As soon as that's done, it will be about two months down-the-road.

Ms. Stewart asked if it will be ready in time for the History Convention in April.

Ms. McVay responded that it should be ready by then.

Ms. Stewart stated that it is important. There was tremendous interest in the display last year. She was surprised at the number of people who went to the presentation and how well it was received. She believes it will be an annual event.

Mr. Porter suggested that the map could be showcased. The History Convention is an ideal place because the kind of people who go would have an interest.

Ms. Stewart noted that the Trails Plan said that a lot of the people who go on trails are trying to get access to historic and cultural sites. She noted that she received a lot of requests to have the map unfolded. She asked if there would be unfolded maps available.

Ms. McVay responded there would be about 200-300 unfolded maps available.

Ms. Stewart suggested staff consider laminating some of the maps to sell in the gift shop. She believes people will be more than willing to pay for them.

Mr. Porter suggested bringing a supply of them to the convention in Flagstaff in April. A place will be provided to sell them from.

Ms. Bradley stated that she would like to have them dedicated by the Governor.

Ms. McVay stated that it is both a privilege and fun to work with ASCOT. This year the Health Department community came to the table. They actually put in the County Health Plan that every county has to hold a National Trails Day.

Chairman Hays returned to Agenda Item E.

## **E. BOARD ACTION ITEMS**

2. **Consider the State Trails System Nominations** – Staff recommends 16 of the 24 nominations received for inclusion in the State Trails System; staff does not recommend 7 of the nominations for inclusion in the State Trails System and recommends tabling 1 nomination until further discussions can take place with ASCOT. ASCOT met on October 2, 2004 and concurs with the recommendations with the exception of the nomination recommended to be tabled.

Ms. McVay reported that 24 nominations were received this year for the State Trails System. The deadline was July 1, 2004. Staff reviews the nominations and make a good effort to get to every trail that they can, especially those trails that are of concern. ASCOT designated a subcommittee to review each nomination. This year there is an interesting set of trails. The subcommittee met for a total of 5-6 hours this year. They made their recommendations and forwarded them to the full ASCOT. Those recommendations are provided in the Board Packet. The first table includes 16 trails



that were unanimously recommended for approval into the State Trails System. The second table includes the 7 trails that were not recommended for the State Trails System. The table makes very clear why those trails were not recommended.

Ms. McVay noted that about two years ago ASP officially recognized water trails in the state. There has been a lot of theory work on what water trails mean. This year the first actual water trail nomination was received. It brought up a lot of things that no one thinks about until there is an actual nomination. This trail is in Yuma, on the Colorado River. The State Trails System has a very strict policy of no motorized trails.

Obviously, the Colorado River has motorized use on it. The City of Yuma does not control that waterway. The subcommittee struggled with this water trail. At its full meeting, ASCOT discussed this water trail and the issues associated with it at length. ASCOT did not approve this water trail by an 8-7 vote. She noted that staff needs more time to discuss this and are not ready to turn away water trails just yet. Staff are requesting the Board table this nomination for one year.

Ms. Stewart stated that she agreed it is important to continue to look into that issue. She believes that is the trail she had the opportunity to canoe on. It was quite nice.

Chairman Hays noted that those water trails can be very important to the bird watching community. While he has not seen this area, Tonopah would be a great area where wildlife could be viewed from the shore.

Mr. Porter asked if it is really necessary to table this trail for a full year.

Ms. McVay responded affirmatively.

#### **Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move that the Yuma West Wetlands Water Trail be tabled until further discussions can take place regarding water trail policies.

Ms. Stewart seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **Board Action**

Ms. Stewart: I move the 16 trails listed in Table 1 be approved for inclusion into the State Trails System.

Mr. Beechum seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. McVay reported that one trail of interest to some members of the public at this meeting today is the Maricopa Trail not being recommended for inclusion in the State Trails System (STS). This is a more than 200 mile trail that runs through Maricopa County and connects all of their regional parks. ASCOT feels that this is a really important trail; however they feel that some of the implementation and alignments may not be determined useful to actually be in the STS.

Mr. Dan Gruber, representing ASCOT, addressed the Board. He stated that he is a citizen-at-large member of ASCOT as well as a member of the STS Nomination Subcommittee. He was present to describe to the Board the discussion the subcommittee had regarding the Maricopa Trail plan and the basis for their recommendation that it not be included in the STS at this time.

Mr. Gruber stated that ASCOT thinks that this is a terrific concept and that it exemplifies the kind of regional planning that the State Parks Board and ASCOT have been wanting for a long time. However, ASCOT thinks that this application for inclusion in STS is premature. The Maricopa Trail is a grand concept. It involves 17 different jurisdictions. At the time of the application for inclusion in STS, ASCOT understood that not all of those jurisdictions had given final approval for the sections of the trail that are in their jurisdictions. They understand that some of the alignments have not been approved by the relevant individual jurisdictions. There were a variety of other landowners identified in different jurisdictions that could affect the ultimate implementation of various segments of this trail. They were told, and it is clear from seeing this concept, that it could be years or even decades until this plan comes to full fruition. As a result, this plan does not in fact meet (or did not at the time of application meet) some of the criteria for inclusion in STS. Given all of the unknowns, rather than including this concept in the STS now, ASCOT encourages the nomination of individual segments of the trail that have definite plans, alignments, all necessary approvals and land issues resolved and that, therefore, satisfy all the established criteria for inclusion in the State Trails System.

Mr. Gruber stated that, having said that, they understand that inclusion of the total Maricopa Trail Plan in the STS now might help the Maricopa County Trail Commission, in fact, get some of the approvals necessary for implementation. ASCOT understands that. Rather than using the STS for that purpose, ASCOT voted to provide a formal expression of its strong support for the plan and for implementation to the Maricopa County Trail Commission for their use with the various jurisdictions as they see fit. ASCOT believes that is the way to accomplish that particular purpose without being inconsistent with established criteria for STS.

Mr. Porter noted that this Board could, if presented with an appropriate Resolution, endorse the Plan. He suggested that if ASCOT wished to do so, they could forward a Resolution for the Parks Board's discussion and possible adoption.

Mr. Travous stated that he could send a letter along with ASCOT's letter of support on behalf of the Board endorsing and encouraging the Maricopa Trail.

Ms. Stewart noted that it is her understanding that the concern is that the Board would not know exactly what they were approving should they approve the entire trail because no one knows where it would be. It couldn't be included in the Trails Guide because the map can't be drawn yet.

Mr. Gruber responded that, based on their understanding of the situation at the time of the application, because of approval issues, coordination issues, and other entities in some of the individual jurisdictions some of these segments (even if they are chronically alive) might not, in fact, be implemented.

Ms. Stewart noted that if that occurred ASCOT would be coming to the Board and asking that they be delisted.

Ms. McVay added that staff concurs with and supports ASCOT's recommendation. Staff are a little concerned about accepting this nomination as it was presented at the time of the application. As an example, a year or so ago there was a Forest Service trail that was 5 miles in length; 2/10 of a mile of that trail fell on private property that they

could not secure. In this case, bigger items are missing. The Board would be setting a precedent for future trails or past trails.

Ms. Stewart asked if this is consistent with previous practices.

Ms. McVay responded affirmatively. She then introduced Mr. Chris Coover to address the Board regarding changes that have occurred since the time of application.

Mr. Chris Coover, Manager, Maricopa Trail, addressed the Board. He distributed information to the Board. He stated that when they put together the application in May and June they did not have a lot of the data that they have today. One of the items in the packet he distributed is the letter regarding the 24 cities and towns in Maricopa County. He believes that the core of the planning effort over a 3 1/2 year period was to coordinate with each of the towns and cities in Maricopa County. They were not able, through funding problems, to basically look at the whole region. They worked with each of the cities – they worked with the Mayors, the Assistant Mayors, the City Councils, the Planning Departments, and the Assistant Planning Department Directors. In the vast majority of the cases, the plan as it is drawn in the 194-page planning document literally is the municipalities' or towns' trail alignment. Within the plan document itself there are 114 segments. Those segments are actually laid out specifically on which side of the canal bank, which side of the river bank, which side of the street – they literally go through the entire 240 miles of the trail laying out the exact alignment. One of the things they did over an 18-month period was to create 54 partnerships. Within that, there were 19 partnerships with different governmental agencies (federal, state, and local) to secure the land that existed.

Mr. Coover reported that over the last three months they additionally created their first Annual Report. In that Annual Report they go through each exact segment and find out where things stand with each jurisdiction. He was very pleased to report that literally 79% of the land where the trail exists today in plan is secure and in place with their 19 land partners. He reported that the remaining 21% is covered by the Board of Supervisors' adoption on August 16 (after the application was made) that mandates that all of the County agencies (should the trail fall outside of the cities) will work to ensure that the trail is in place (including flood control, transportation, and, most specifically, planning and development). When subdivisions that potentially would encroach on the trail or known property owners go in for their development master plan with the County they are literally mandated by the Board of Supervisors to set aside the path for the trail in its directed alignment.

Mr. Coover stated that he is here to let the Board know that they have the plan secured. More importantly, they highly value working with those 54 partners. That is why they wanted to be included in the system. They see a tremendous future if they can work with ASP. Their 10 parks have 120,000 acres. This trail system will basically appeal to the people who live in Maricopa County, but they feel very strongly that this will be a very unifying opportunity for family use and visitors. They did extensive demographics over the last three years and determined that about 94% of the people who go through their parks have stated that they would support a tax to create the trails. They are not going in that direction, but it serves as a barometer of how things are going.

Mr. Coover stated that he could assure the Parks Board that after the Board of Supervisors adopted this on August 16 the plan is intact, its implementation is assured,

and the only anomaly they have at the moment is how soon it will be done based on funding. He is very happy to report that the Board of Supervisors has, through its budgeting process, set aside \$5.5 million for seed money over the next 6 years to implement the areas they consider most beneficial. They want to be partners with the ASP system.

Mr. Porter asked how much State Trust Land needs to be acquired.

Mr. Coover responded that it is about 13%. The Right-of-Way Department is considered a partner in the sense that they have two applications with them that are currently under their consideration. Work with their staff has gone beautifully and, in many cases, because they have to purchase the rights-of-way, they go into areas that are considered devalued by the state but very beneficial to the Trails folks (washes, etc., along areas where people cannot build and houses cannot go). They are actually a partner because in many cases because of existing rights-of-way that are in perpetuity they don't need to purchase a 100' wide trail corridor to have the open space. They can do it with 10'. That 10' is 7 miles long. It is a huge savings. They literally became a partner.

Ms. Stewart asked if they had any problems in terms of going ahead with purchasing State Trust Land related to Growing Smarter.

Mr. Coover responded they have not. They feel they are actually being assisted by the Land Department specifically to try to benefit and figure out ways to work in the devalued areas. Money has been set aside for the purchase of those devalued areas.

Ms. Stewart noted that Mr. Coover mentioned that Maricopa County wanted to partner with the Board. The obvious things are being listed as a state trail and possibly applying for matching grants to purchase some of the land to build the trails. She asked if there is any other way the County had in mind to partner.

Mr. Coover responded that they were very fortunate to be able to create a 501(c)3 foundation which is a standalone organization. They are willing to raise money to build the trails and build a visitors center at every one of their parks. They want to do something similar to the center at Lake Pleasant at those locations. They anticipate using them as information locations. They were very hopeful that over a period of time they could build on their Spur Cross effort with the state and show how we can work together, whether that is joint marketing at the visitor centers and specifically, if this goes forward, they will have a kiosk for a visitor's center at Bank One Ballpark. They believe those kinds of opportunities are tremendous as far as the future is concerned. They would like to elevate their relationship with the Board to be mutually beneficial. As people come to a trailhead, a visitor's center, or on the Maricopa Trail they could be made aware of ASP. If they come to the state parks system and are coming on to the Valley perhaps they could participate at one of the County's facilities. They see a tremendous opportunity. They see this as the first step in getting together to see what our mutual benefits could be by working together.

Mr. Coover added that, specifically relevant to the designation, they have staff who can assist Ms. McVay in whatever ways are necessary to getting it into the document. They applied under the proposed category only because they had not finished it yet. Now

they would like to come back and have those segments, once they are constructed and signed, go into the book. They are at a middle point.

Mr. Porter stated that he believes the point is that the Board simply needs to be able to have something to look at that demonstrates the Maricopa Trail is sure enough and is doable even though it may not be anywhere near constructed. He believes this is tremendously exciting. It is very important that the Board be a part of this. He believes it is a win/win proposition for Maricopa County and the Board and in the best interests of both to work together. This trail will afford a lot of people the opportunity to do things that piggyback with the very things the Board want to see done.

Mr. Coover noted that 114 segments are literally laid out in the document as adopted by the Board of Supervisors. They will be county-wide with all of the County's agencies. That means that if it's transportation they need to know exactly where the trail will go. They feel they have a much higher degree of specificity than they provided in June.

Mr. Porter suggested they get that information to ASCOT. He felt sure ASCOT would get it to the Board in a hurry as soon as they are ready to begin bringing some of these in.

Ms. Stewart encouraged Mr. Coover to look at the agency's various grant programs. There were no applicants for the Local, Regional and State Park (LRSP) grants for open space and trail type parks. Some of the things Maricopa County is doing may qualify.

Mr. Coover responded that it was their understanding that they had to be admitted to the STS before they could apply.

Ms. Stewart stated that she did not believe that was true for the LRSP grants if they are buying land for a park.

Ms. McVay responded that in order to apply for a Trails grant it has to be in the STS to be eligible.

Ms. Stewart noted that in some areas they would be building centers.

Mr. Coover responded that the centers are in their existing parks.

Ms. Stewart noted that that would be something they would be eligible for.

Mr. Porter stated that he believed that they could become eligible fast enough if they get some of these segments approved.

Ms. Stewart stated that her message to them is to not only look at the Trails money. There are other pots of money that some parts of the plan might qualify for that they haven't really thought about.

Mr. Fred Pfeifer, member of ASCOT, Maricopa County Trail Commission, and APS Hiking Club, addressed the Board. He stated that he has been a member of ASCOT for 10 years, 6 of which he served as Chairman of the Nominating Committee. He noted that he is not representing the majority of the ASCOT members. He has been a member of the Maricopa Trail Commission for three years. He noted that that commission has been dissolved. They have been implementing this trail for about a year. This trail is at a point where it is completely planned out. The only thing that ASCOT had a problem with was not having the cities' signatures. They now have those signatures. He stated

that he would hate to have this go another year without it being on the STS. That would mean at least two years before Maricopa County could get any money for the trail. This is a trail – it is not a park; it doesn't include the parks even though there may be a very small link within a park. They need trail money. He has been on ASCOT's nominating committee for about 10 years. He would really like to see this trail come on as one trail. It is 30 segments of which 5 are already in the STS as city trails. He would like to see it go in as one proposed trail. As they come into existence they come in as segments. He respectfully asked the Board to table this nomination, go back to ASCOT in light of the new signatures and information, and ask them to give this trail further consideration.

Ms. McVay noted that there are more concerns than just the missing signatures.

Mr. Pfeifer responded that he understood that and that Mr. Coover's staff could assist with those concerns. He asked ASCOT at their meeting what their issues were and ASCOT said it was just the missing signatures. He would like to see this trail tabled and go back to ASCOT for further consideration.

Mr. Coover stated that they learned a lot from the Arizona Trail. They were hoping that there would be a way for them to go forward with the Board and then come back with these segments as they are built out.

Ms. Stewart stated that she wouldn't have a problem if ASCOT wanted to take another look at it in view of the additional information and send it back to the Board if they wish. She is hesitant, without a recommendation from ASCOT, of overruling their recommendation. She has seen in the past that they are very thorough, they spend a lot of hours on this, and have expertise that she does not feel she has. She is certainly open to considering it again at any time that ASCOT wants to send it back to the Board.

Chairman Hays asked if there is a limitation on the timeframe ASCOT can bring this back to the Board.

Ms. McVay responded that it can be brought back at any time. She noted that the grant funding cycle for this year has a requirement that applications be received by February 2005.

Mr. Coover noted that they are aware of that. They are more interested in partnering. If that's a possibility with ASCOT, then they would be more interested in forming a relationship soon. They would prefer to not wait another year for admission to STS.

#### **Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move that the 7 trails listed in Table 2 not be approved for inclusion into the State Trails System. However, it is requested that ASCOT review the Maricopa Trail issue further and report back to the Board.

Ms. Stewart seconded the motion.

Mr. Porter noted that his motion, in addition to not approving trails for inclusion in the STS, is requesting that ASCOT go back and review the Maricopa Trail. That leaves it open. If nothing else, ASCOT can just send a note to the Board that informs the Board of their feelings.

Ms. Bradley suggested changing the language of the motion to state that the request is for ASCOT to talk about developing a partnership. She wants to be careful about setting a precedent for future contest to ask the Board to second-guess the subcommittee's recommendation to ASCOT.

Mr. Porter responded that he is only asking ASCOT to look at it. He added that he liked his motion the way it is. He noted that his motion is that the 7 trails listed not be approved, including the Maricopa Trail, and then that the Board asks (not tells or directs) ASCOT to take another look at the Maricopa Trail.

Chairman Hays called for a vote on the motion on the floor. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Hays asked if the Board can look forward to hearing from ASCOT in the spring. He does not want to wait a year for a response.

Ms. Bradley responded that ASCOT could respond by the spring.

Ms. Stewart asked if the Board wanted the Director to send a letter on behalf of the Board that, although the Board did not approve the inclusion of the trail at this time it is very enthusiastic about the project and looks forward to working with Maricopa County on full implementation of the trail in the future.

Chairman Hays responded that it would be very acceptable for that letter to be sent.

3. **Consider Policy to Delist Proposed Trails in the State Trails System** – Staff recommends adopting a policy to delist proposed trails in the State Trails System that do not show activity to becoming an existing trail within five years. ASCOT met on October 2, 2004 and concurs with the recommendation.

Ms. McVay reported that ASCOT are asking the Board to adopt a policy that would delist proposed trails in the State Trails System if they have not shown any action or activity of being built up within the past five years.

Ms. Stewart stated that after the Board approved something, she believes that in order for it to be unapproved – or delisted – it should come back to the Board. While she certainly wants staff's and ASCOT's recommendations she does not believe it is appropriate, after the Board has taken action, for that action to be changed by the committee or staff.

Mr. Beechum suggested putting standards in place to follow for delisting trails.

Mr. Porter responded that it is his understanding that that would be somewhat of a subjective decision to be made on a case-by-case basis. He would be concerned about trying to have too rigid a set of standards if, in fact, ASCOT sends it to the Board in a motion.

### **Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move that all proposed trails accepted in the State Trails System will be reviewed five years after acceptance for progress towards completion. If no significant action has been shown the trail is subject to delisting upon the recommendation from ASCOT to the Parks Board.

Ms. Stewart seconded the motion.

Ms. Stewart noted that it does have some standards. The standard would be no significant progress toward completion within five years.

The motion carried unanimously.

4. **Consider Adopting a Livestock Grazing Policy for Arizona State Parks' Natural Areas** – Staff recommends that the Parks Board approve NAPAC's recommendation that permits livestock grazing on State Parks Board-controlled Natural Areas provided that a grazing management plan developed by the Natural Resources Conservation Service or other credible organization, and reviewed by NAPAC, has been completed.

Mr. Ream reported that this policy was reviewed at the last Board meeting. There was no staff recommendation at that time. After the Board's review and discussion, staff removed the language as Mr. Cordasco requested from the background statement. Staff recommends passage.

Ms. Stewart stated that she has concerns about the present language. She doesn't have a problem, per se, with the Board allowing grazing. Her problem is how it fits in with our total process. She looked again at the Resource Inventory Assessment done at Red Rock. She believes that just doing a grazing management plan is not sufficient. The Board really needs to look at how the grazing impacts the resource and how it fits in to the total plan. She referred to page 79 of the Resource Inventory Assessment where it says, "a critical need is develop and implement an integrated natural resource plan for each park and natural area." It seems to her that the Board needs to first develop this plan for any park or natural area where the Board is considering allowing grazing and that integrated natural resource plan needs to assess the impact of any grazing on the resource and how it fits in with other uses. She believes the same is true for any recreation use. Basically, we are talking about and moving toward being science-based and looking at how this affects the resource. She believes it has to be more comprehensive.

Ms. Stewart added that she noticed that the wording changed from the original recommendation that "no grazing be permitted unless" certain things occurred first to, it be permitted "providing". She believes the wording is clearer where it says something is not done "unless". It makes it clearer that one has to precede the other. The Board is not a ranching operation. At least with the natural areas, the Board is required to protect the resource for certain values. Obviously, this plan has got to look at that.

Ms. Stewart noted that her third concern is the specific mentioning of any organization that's going to do it. She does not believe it is appropriate to list the Natural Resource Conservation Service. She would rather leave it open. It is up to the Board and will be up to staff to locate a source. She thinks this is too narrow a focus at this time and that it is better to leave it open. There are excellent capabilities at ASU and at the UA through their extension service. She doesn't know if either of the scientists, Dr. Toomey or Ms. Roberts, have anything they would want to add. It seems to her that it has to be part of this.



Ms. Stewart stated that she believes the wording has to be that no livestock grazing be permitted on State Parks-controlled Natural Areas unless an integrated natural resources plan has been developed that assesses the impact of grazing on the resource.

Mr. Ream responded that Dr. Toomey came to this meeting to address those scientific needs that staff would recommend. This is a NAPAC-forwarded recommendation. There is a representative present from NAPAC present at this meeting.

Ms. Stewart asked if NAPAC reconsidered their recommendation after the last Board meeting.

Mr. Ream responded that because it is the NAPAC recommendation, he would assume that is the case.

Ms. Stewart noted that NAPAC recommended that no livestock grazing be permitted on ASP's controlled natural areas unless a grazing management plan reviewed by NAPAC has been completed. She is concerned that NAPAC's recommendation has been substantially changed by putting the NRCS in there.

Mr. Ream responded that he was just providing clarification. It was a recommendation. At the last Board meeting, Mr. Cordasco wanted to discuss with staff how he thought it could be better worded. This is Mr. Cordasco's change. It's probably not important that it is done today. Staff can go back and take another look at it. He believes it is important that the Resource Management Plan be a comprehensive look at this. He would guess that Resource Management Plans are somewhere out in the distance. This would give some protection and possible management rules. There have been suggestions made that cattle be turned loose, for example, at San Rafael for purposes of fire protection. Rather than just do that, staff would have these kinds of plans available even if the Resource Management Plan is still being drafted.

Ms. Stewart responded that that is her exact point. If the Board has changed its focus where we've said we want to make informed decisions based on the science, she doesn't believe the Board can do anything less than comprehensive because a lot of it will depend on what will be done with the park. If it's going to be a demonstration ranch, then that's one thing; if it is going to be some other entity then that's something else. She believes that the Board has managed to get through the fire season without the cattle. She believes that is a dead issue now because staff recommended that the Board not do that.

Mr. Porter stated that he does not necessarily feel that the Board has to make sure that there is never any grazing just because those plans are not in place. He believes that there are possible situations where, by everyone's assessment, it would be appropriate for there to be grazing. If there are such areas, then he believes that the protections simply have to be in place. His biggest concern, if the Board wants to go back and retool this, is the mechanism of approval. He doesn't care for the words, for example, "reviewed by". To him, "reviewed" simply means they have taken a look at it. What if they don't like it? It doesn't say that it has to be "approved" by NAPAC. He would be more comfortable with something that, if there is to be a proposal to have grazing, first it has to go to NAPAC, they in turn will pass judgment on whether they feel that the grazing management plan that has been evolved is appropriate in their view. Some-

thing this important ought to then be forward to this Board for ultimate approval based on NAPAC's recommendation.

Mr. Travous responded that staff have gone through that with policies before. The ultimate approval has to rest with this Board because the Board has the ultimate fiduciary responsibility. The Board has the ultimate responsibility in following the laws of the legislature.

Mr. Porter noted that the way it is worded right now it doesn't at all require this Board's approval.

Ms. Stewart added that it doesn't require that they make a specific recommendation one way or the other. "Review" is too weak of a word. The Board may not follow the recommendation. She believes that the whole reason the Board has these committees is to get technical expertise from them that the Board members do not have to make an informed decision based on that information. She does not really see where there are that many parks with natural areas where cattle are likely to be brought in. The only park really at issue is San Rafael.

Mr. Travous noted that cattle are already on Sonoita Creek. Part of this discussion is what needs to be done to move forward to get the cattle out of Sonoita Creek.

Ms. Stewart stated that perhaps San Rafael needs to be dealt with separately. As she understands it, we are in the process right now of putting together some kind of plan. In the instance of San Rafael, the Board cannot make the decision on bringing grazing in until they know how the park is going to be used and how it will affect the resource and its uses. The Board may very well end up having that park as a demonstration ranch. She has no problem with that.

Chairman Hays stated he wanted to point out that while the fire season hazard may be over, every year is a fire hazard year at San Rafael. It has horrendous fires. If it isn't grazed down, we are just asking for a tremendous problem of losing perhaps the buildings, the corrals, outbuildings, etc. He believes that the Board definitely needs to look at fire control tools – not necessarily a range management plan but just grazing it off to protect the property. He believes that, in the future, the Board will have more range lands included in the park system. He does not believe San Rafael is the end of all grazing potential. He believes the Board definitely needs certified range management people from the universities or federal government. We have none of that now.

Mr. Ream offered to bring this issue back after sending out some drafts to the Board.

Ms. Stewart stated that before it comes back to the Board she would like NAPAC to see it so they have the opportunity to give input. She doesn't believe there is anything urgent out there.

Mr. Porter stated that he wants something that is a little more than just a review by NAPAC. He wants them to really have input and in turn make recommendations to the Board.

Ms. Stewart added that she believes it needs to be tied to the resource that the Board is obligated to protect on the basis of having used the Natural Areas money.

Mr. Ream noted that Mr. Marty Jakle, Chairman of NAPAC, was present.

Mr. Jakle addressed the Board. He stated that NAPAC is a viable committee and would be more than happy to review the grazing recommendations and send them back to the Board.

Ms. Stewart stated that she would like staff to work with NAPAC to refine the language and then send it back again. The Board have commented on this issue today and raised their concerns.

Mr. Jakle responded that NAPAC is the Natural Areas Committee. A lot of these areas have a natural value. They want to make sure we do the right thing.

5. **Concession Contract – Lyman Lake State Park** – Staff recommends that the Board authorize the Executive Director or his designee to enter into negotiations and a contract for concession services at Lyman Lake State Park.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that this is the third time this issue has been brought before the Board. Staff are going out one more time for a concession at Lyman Lake and are very hopeful this time because it includes cabin and yurt rentals and because through October of this year there have been more visitors at Lyman Lake than during all of 2003. It is possible that both revenue and attendance at Lyman Lake will double this year. It has been difficult to get anyone to submit proposals in the past.

Ms. Stewart asked who will own the cabins and yurts and whether the rentals of the cabins and yurts would be on the ASP internet reservation system when it is online. She wanted to know if the cabins and yurts would be run totally separate from the rest of the system.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that ASP owns the cabins and yurts. They would be included with the other campgrounds on the internet reservation system. Staff are working on two reservation systems: one for KCSP and one for the campgrounds.

Ms. Stewart asked what staff propose this vendor do in reference to the cabins and yurts other than receive the income.

Mr. Ream responded that it was his idea to include the cabins and yurts wherever possible and let the concessionaires operate them. Funds are not currently available to add this type of additional work to our current staff. There are only 4 cabins and 4 yurts. It was an experiment. The current concessionaire's interest in the cabins and yurts was there, but staff had no track record for them. He suggested in this RFP that a flat rate be requested for them, very much like the way the campsites are done. ASP would get a flat rate for every night they are rented.

Mr. Ream reported that there are two things the concessionaire can do that staff cannot do. Staff do not sit in the office all day long; we have different office hours. There is no one available for people checking in and checking out. The camp store would be open all the time in order to accommodate the guests using the cabins. They would also pick up the maintenance of the cabins (cleaning, etc.). The agency will probably not lose money; it will gain staff time.

Mr. Ream added that there is a catch in the Enabling Legislation for operating these things. He feels very comfortable when they are offered up to a concessionaire and they don't feel like operating them, that the agency is well within its rights to then operate them. He wanted it included in the RFP, but as a flat rate.

Ms. Stewart asked how it will work if there are staff in the area who want to use them. Will they then have to pay the vendor to use the cabins and yurts?

Mr. Ream responded that they would probably have to pay. They belong to the State of Arizona. He feels they were built for a public benefit. We have been able to use some in the past and perhaps provision could be made for use of State per diems in the RFP.

Ms. Stewart asked if the agency will receive some sort of return on its investment and whether the flat rate would be high enough to cover the costs of building.

Mr. Ream responded that staff have discussed this issue. We are a cash flow organization. We live off of our cash flow. Any money that can be put into capital development that will generate cash flow benefits this agency. There is no debt load being carried on any of these projects that we built so there are no repayment plans. He looks at those that were built with Enhancement Fund money as being paid back by reinvesting Enhancement Fund money. Increasing our Enhancement Fund increases our ability to operate and go forth and build more. The beauty of paying as we go is that there is no payback. As to the question of whether we will recoup that investment, yes. Will we recoup it in the same fashion that businesses do (a 30% in the first X number of years), he doesn't know. Because we use that money the prices are kept relatively low. He believes we will get more for the cabins if charged differently. We made \$17,000 more last year than the previous year without the cabins.

Ms. Stewart stated that what she is getting at is that we are giving up a lot and are we getting back enough to warrant what is being given up.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that staff are just going out for proposals. The contract will have to be negotiated with the concessionaire.

Mr. Ream added that if their proposal is not to staff's satisfaction, it will be turned down. He noted that 4% was not enough to cover the agency's investment. And the decision was made to run them ourselves. Now we have a track record and know what we can make off them. Even in the first years of operation staff will expect very close to that. There will be some savings realized by not having to manage them ourselves. That has to be factored in as well. The beauty of it is that we are running that business; we will be able to do some other things in our business with the free time.

#### **Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move that the Arizona State Parks Board authorize the Executive Director or his designee to enter into negotiations and a contract for concession services at Lyman Lake State Park.

Mr. Beechum seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

6. **Consider Approval of FY 2005-FY 2007 Law Enforcement and Boating Safety Fund (LEBSF) Allocation Schedule** – Staff recommends adopting the allocation percentages for participating counties calculated in the Attachment for distributing the Law Enforcement and Boating Safety Fund accrued during state fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007.

**Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move to adopt the allocation percentages for participating counties calculated in Attachment A for distributing the Law Enforcement and Boating Safety Fund accrued during state fiscal years 2005, 2006 and 2007.

Mr. Beechum seconded the motion.

Ms. Stewart stated that she did not have enough information. She asked if the allocation is statutorily mandated and whether staff have looked at the boat use days and the amount of money that's already been spent by the counties participating in the program for personnel. It appears that those who already have something get more. She asked if that is required by statute.

Mr. Travous responded that he has been directly involved for several years.

Ms. Stewart asked if there was anyone else present to speak to this or whether there is anyone from AORCC present to speak to this issue.

Mr. Travous responded that he is a member of AORCC. He noted that staff look at the boat use days and try to divide it up amongst the counties' results. The County Sheriffs bless it. Maricopa County, for instance, could get a big chunk of that money but generally don't because they have other ways of getting money. There is an agreement between Sheriffs on the division of the money. Other considerations include FTEs, how much it costs, and there are legislatively-mandated usages for that money.

Ms. Stewart asked if the legislation says anything other than what the money must be used for (i.e., how the money is to be allocated).

Mr. Travous responded it does not. AORCC and ASP staff determine how to allocate the money. The big thing is that the County Sheriffs get together and advise what they feel is fair.

Ms. Stewart asked if this is different from how it was allocated in the past.

Mr. Travous responded that he has not heard of any procedural changes from the past.

Mr. Ziemann added that it is consistent with how it was done in the past. The very specifics of the percentages out to the thousandth point are probably a little different. The process is the same.

Mr. Porter noted that he did take the time to play with it a little bit to see what the proportionality looked like.

Chairman Hays noted that there's been no controversy in the past and that it appears to have work very well.

Mr. Porter noted that Mohave County is certainly getting its part of the pie.

Chairman Hays called for a vote on the motion on the floor. The motion carried unanimously.

7. **Appoint New Members to the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee (HPAC)** – Staff recommends that the Board appoint one individual to fill the Local Government vacancy on HPAC and that he/she serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2005; that two individuals be appointed to fill the Citizen-

at-Large vacancies on HPAC and that they serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2005; and that one individual be appointed to fill the Preservation Professional vacancy on HPAC and that he/she serve the remaining year on a three-year term beginning January 1, 2005 and ending on December 31, 2005.

Mr. Ziemann reported that HPAC advises the Parks Board on the effective implementation of the Heritage Fund for the Historic Preservation program. There will be four vacancies on that committee on January 1. He noted that HPAC's recommendations appear on page 82 of the Board Packet. That recommendation needs to be amended. An E-mail was received on Tuesday afternoon from the proposed Preservation Professional, Mark Vinson, stating, "I am honored that my application was accepted and recommended to the Board for appointment on HPAC but I have subsequently withdrawn from consideration in support of Joe Nuci who is the other Preservation Professional who had applied." Mr. Vinson went on to ask that Mr. Nuci receive the Board's strongest consideration for appointment at this time. Mr. Vinson stated that he worked with Mr. Nuci in Tempe for the past 14 years and he knows of no one who has a superior amount of technical knowledge, technical skills, and knowledge of historic resources.

Mr. Porter asked if anyone from HPAC was present to speak to whether HPAC have any problem essentially relating to Mr. Vinson interposing his nomination for HPAC's. He wants to ensure this won't fly badly with HPAC.

Mr. Ziemann responded that no one from HPAC is present today.

Ms. Stewart noted that she has concerns. In reviewing the requirements for sitting on HPAC and reviewing the information provided, some of the most qualified candidates may not appear on the recommendation list. On the other hand, since there is no one present from HPAC she is hesitant to ignore their recommendation. It also appears to her that perhaps two of the people who are already on HPAC up for re-nomination may not have been qualified when they were first put on. Their only qualification at this point may be the fact that they have served on the committee. That is a bit disconcerting.

Mr. Porter stated that he noticed, in passing, too, that the Board received background information on all of the candidates except Mr. Rushin. His bio was not included in the packet. He happens to know and respect Mr. Rushin.

Ms. Stewart stated she is specifically concerned about the requirement that they be active in or familiar with historic preservation. From the information provided to the Board, one of the Citizen-at-Large candidates has no indication of fulfilling that requirement in the first appointment. The underlying knowledge appears to have been obtained while serving on the committee. That may be true of both of the Citizen-at-Large candidates.

Mr. Porter suggested that HPAC should take a look at this. He is not prepared to do a lot of second-guessing at this time. He has no problem with Mr. Rushin's background not being included. So far as Mr. Vinson's request is concerned, he supposed that they liked Mr. Vinson and his judgment call.

**Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move that the following individuals be appointed to fill the Citizen-at-Large vacancies on HPAC and that they serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2005: Helen Jill McCormick and Theresa Nesser.

I further move that the following individual be appointed to fill the Local Government vacancy on HPAC and that he serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2005: Thomas Rushin.

I move that the following individual be appointed to fill the Preservation Professional vacancy on HPAC and that he serve the remaining year on a three-year term beginning January 1, 2005 and ending December 31, 2005: Joseph Nuci.

Mr. Beechum seconded the motion.

Ms. Stewart stated that she is willing to vote for it, but she did have a concern that the Board needs to more carefully look at these nominations in the future and that the information they receive in the bios needs to demonstrate that they do, in fact, have the required qualifications. She believes they minimally do now simply because they have served and therefore learned something about it. With the number of really qualified applicants, she believes that there needs to be a real focus on that. She believes that if the committee is going to make recommendations to the Board, they need to carefully review the qualifications as well as the geographic distribution. There are two people each from two of the smaller counties. She realizes it is awkward when it is the committee itself is working as a whole rather than a subcommittee working on the recommendations. One of their members stated she wanted to serve another term yet admitted she hadn't been able to fully participate during the last year and hopes to be able to this coming year. Her qualifications are rather normal and there were some really impressive candidates. She hopes the committee had some additional information that wasn't obvious from what the Board received.

Chairman Hays called for a vote on the motion on the floor. The motion carried unanimously.

8. **Appoint New Members to the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group (OHVAG)** – Staff recommends that one person be appointed to fill the Citizen-at-Large vacancy on OHVAG and that he/she serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2005 and that two people be appointed to fill the OHV organization vacancies and that they serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2005.

**Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move that Michael Sipes be appointed to fill the Citizen-at-Large vacancy on OHVAG and that he serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2005.

I move that Rebecca Antle and Sandra McCullen be appointed to fill the OHV organization vacancies and that they each serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2005.

Mr. Beechum seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

9. **Appoint New Members to the Arizona State Committee on Trails** – Staff recommends that one individual be named to fill one vacancy on ASCOT to serve

a one-year term beginning January 1, 2005; that one individual be named to fill one vacancy on ASCOT to serve a two-year term beginning January 1, 2005; and that eight individuals be named to fill eight vacancies on ASCOT to serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2005.

Ms. Hernbrode stated for the record that her father is an applicant to serve on this committee. She noted that members of ASCOT are not paid for their service on the committee. For the record, it has been determined that there is no conflict of interest.

Ms. Bradley noted that there are 10 vacancies on ASCOT for the year 2005. There were 15 applications. She credited her colleagues who heavily recruited high-quality candidates. One of their intentions is to ensure there is diversity and representation across the counties. She thanked the Board for their support in this effort by reimbursing travel to ASCOT meetings. That really allows them to recruit from the far corners of the state.

Mr. Porter noted that there are 10 vacancies on ASCOT, up to 3 may be filled by Citizens-at-Large, up to 3 may be filled by Government Agencies, and up to 7 may be filled by representatives of trails organizations. Somehow that doesn't compute. There are 10 vacancies.

Ms. Stewart responded that it says "up to 7"; that doesn't mean there are 7. They are missing information on whether ASCOT has a recommendation as to who gets the one-year and who gets the two-year and who gets the three-year terms.

Ms. Bradley noted that was included in the recommendation.

#### **Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move that the Chris Breitmeyer be appointed to fill one vacancy on ASCOT for a one-year term beginning January 1, 2005.

I move that Michael Studer be appointed to fill one vacancy on ASCOT, and that he serve a two-year term beginning January 1, 2005.

I move that the following individuals fill the eight vacancies on ASCOT for a three-year term each beginning January 1, 2005: Don Applegate, Bonnie Bariola, Maureen DeCindis, Tom Fitzgerald, Dan Gruber, Robert Hernbrode, Oliver James Horton, and Eric Smith.

Ms. Stewart seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

- 10. Appoint Members to the Natural Areas Program Advisory Committee (NAPAC)** – Staff recommends that two individuals be appointed to fill vacancies on NAPAC for a four-year term beginning January 1, 2005; that one individual be appointed to fill one vacancy on NAPAC for a two-year term beginning January 1, 2005; and that one individual be appointed to fill one vacancy on NAPAC for a one-year term beginning January 1, 2005.

Ms. Stewart stated that she feels it is important that Ms. Laurel Arndt, who has been a long-term member, be appointed to a four-year term. She has been invaluable to the committee.



Mr. Ream suggested that if Ms. Arndt is appointed to a four-year term that the two-year term should be awarded to Scott Wilbor or Trevor Hare since both are from Pima County. Then, if there's a chance to mix it up again in two years they can; if not, then one of the two-year terms can be continued. There is no particular recommendation. Both are certainly qualified. He suggested Mr. Wilbor for the two-year term just because Ms. Kennedy and Mr. Wilbor are both Audubon Society representatives.

Ms. Stewart asked if there was any recommendation regarding the areas of expertise.

Ms. Roberts responded that she has been working with Ms. Arndt since coming on with ASCOT and has also worked with Mr. Wilbor and Mr. Hare.

Ms. Stewart asked, in terms of the remaining members of NAPAC, whether there are any holes that need to be filled or any areas where particular expertise is needed.

Ms. Roberts responded that, from her interaction, Mr. Hare would be a better fit for the other four-year term.

### **Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move that Laurel Arndt and Trevor Hare be appointed to fill the Natural Areas Program Advisory Committee vacancies for a four-year term each beginning January 1, 2005.

I move that Scott Wilbor be appointed to fill one vacancy on the Natural Areas Program Advisory Committee for a two-year term beginning January 1, 2005.

I move that Linda Kennedy be appointed to fill one vacancy on the Natural Areas Program Advisory Committee for a one-year term beginning January 1, 2005.

Ms. Stewart seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Travous noted that a member of the public has been patiently waiting and requested the Board move to Agenda Item I.

## **I. PARKS**

### **1. Section Report**

#### **Presentation by Salt River Project and The Nature Conservancy on Verde River Properties**

Mr. Travous reported that he received a letter on October 23 from Mr. Charlie Ester from SRP explaining that the SRP Committee on Habitat Conservation Plan has completed operation on Roosevelt Lake. As a part of that plan they recently acquired 125 acres on the Verde River just east of the bridge. Also as part of that conservation plan there are reservoirs on the Verde River that they also need to acquire and manage. There have been discussions about a partnership. SRP have some specific needs and know that they need advice on the properties. They have a goal, as do we, that the Willow Flycatcher and other endangered species are not harmed in any way. We have management capacity and capability in that area that could extend the Verde River Greenway from the bridge on to where the river meets the bottom of the Forest Service's boundary. Staff want to explore that with SRP. The Board will be in the Verde Valley in January and that might be an opportunity to see what it is we are trying to do.

Mr. Ester, SRP, added that perhaps it would be a good opportunity to take a look at the site and determine how to meet the requirements of the state in promoting the core project and also maintain the land, particularly the habitats. They really feel that there are opportunities to work together with ASP to meet both goals. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to work together.

Mr. Travous noted that ASP has management capability that has already been demonstrated in that area. Staff will meet with SRP over the next few months to discuss what their specific needs are and see if there is a partnership opportunity to bring to the Board.

Ms. Stewart asked if this is next to land that is already in the Board's plan.

Mr. Travous responded that it is not; it would enlarge that plan. Some parts of it will be more challenging because it is more populated than others. This part represents an opportunity now.

Ms. Stewart asked how large it is.

Mr. Travous responded it is probably under half a mile.

Chairman Hays asked if there was legislation going back 20 years to expand the Greenway.

Mr. Travous responded that there were no boundaries set. The legislation indicated that the land would have to be purchased through Natural Areas or Heritage Fund money. There was no limit on the acreage in the statute.

Ms. Stewart asked if the Board would have a field trip in January.

Mr. Travous responded that he would make it a gathering point in January to go out to see the 125 acres SRP already has and visit from areas where possible from the bridge on down toward the Forest Service's end.

Mr. Travous added that he sees SRP's role as being needing to protect the Willow Flycatcher. They are also getting some off-highway vehicle intrusions. They don't have the capacity to manage that. If ASP could help them buy some land and then get money donated back for operating costs from that purchase, then ASP could increase its operating capacity and add staff like Mr. Costello to manage and build some trails that would be closed when the Flycatcher is nesting. Those are all things that need to be discussed.

Ms. Stewart stated that she is interested in access and if there are private properties in the vicinity.

Mr. Travous responded that staff will be looking at the private desert at the first part of the Verde River Greenway and private properties between the bridge and where it finally hits Forest Service land.

Ms. Stewart noted that, when looking at acquiring property, she always questions how the public will access the land, how it will benefit the public, whether it will only be an amenity for a small group of people rather than truly accessible by the public or if there will be sufficient restrictions in terms of protecting the species that the public will be able to see it but not abuse it. She believes those questions need to be considered.

Mr. Travous responded that that will be the crux of the partnership. There will be very specific things that they would have to live by.

Ms. Stewart noted that there has to be a balance in what is being provided to the public to justify becoming the policeman for this area. It's the same situation as when the Board got involved with part of the Avatar properties.

Chairman Hays called for a recess at 1:15 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 1:37 p.m.

## **F. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

### **1. Activities Since September 23, 2004**

### **2. Strategic Plan Update (including an update on GIS and PAMS presentation)**

Mr. Travous reported that staff are combining Project 11 participants and Chapter 7 participants. Executive Staff saw a presentation last week on PAMS. There are some very smart people working for the agency. A lot of what will be done regarding conservation will be information management. Mr. Eatherly and staff will provide the Board with a PowerPoint presentation on PAMS.

Mr. Eatherly reported that the Parks Board charged the agency and the Executive Director charged each of the employees with implementing the Board's new Vision – To become the outstanding resource management organization. In order to meet that challenge we must develop a better understanding of what resources we have, assess their condition, monitor the resources for potential changes, and better understand the impacts that are being made by management decisions on those resources. To implement this Vision will require a major commitment by the Parks Board and the staff. Staff will need to develop an information base that will serve as a foundation for the management of all the parks' resources. Better management will result from easily-accessible data that will be much more detailed than the information that was presented in the Red Rock report. Each layer of this information must be developed; then the layers of information can be assembled and analyzed to enhance decision-making.

Mr. Eatherly reported that two kinds of information are required to build this database. They are spatial data (location) and documents. Over the next six months the PAMS team will need to identify the categories, subcategories, shape file, the feature data sets, and metadata. They will have to identify the process to create a system and identify a process to implement and maintain that system. They will have to identify resources needed to accomplish a working system and identify the end result, the products, and questions to be answered.

Mr. Eatherly reported that he is serving as the coordinator of PAMS, a large team made up of 20 members of staff. From those 20 members, a subcommittee has been formed. That subcommittee will make today's presentation. Ms. Tanna Thornberg is chairing the subcommittee, but due to illness could not be present today. Members of the subcommittee present include Mr. Ray Warriner, Mr. Brad McNeill, Mr. Steve Savage, and Mr. Vince Schiavitti. Mr. Keith Ayotte (Northern Region Manager) also serves on the subcommittee, but could not be present today.

Mr. Schiavitti reported that there are two kinds of data that staff are concerned with: one is spatial data and the other is document data. He would address spatial data.

Mr. Schiavitti stated that spatial data is that information that is placed on a map. It involves the GIS application and uses GIS terminology. He referred to a chart that showed the outline of the geodatabase. It is basically the house in which all the data sit. The chart showed the breakdown of all the different categories. He explained that the most important thing to deal with before data is selected is the organizational structure into which the data will be placed. He discussed the various "boxes" on the chart and the information that will be included in each. He noted that additional staff will be required to maintain this information. In regard to the organizational process, the nature of the data itself and how it will be stored has to be considered.

Mr. Steve Savage noted that each box on the chart represents a class of entity in the field that a map can be made of (trails, wells, etc.). On the other hand, a lot of the information in the park is related to document data that tells more about those entities but is not something that can be attached as a map in the GIS.

Mr. Savage stated that he would discuss some of the tasks involved in creating a document library. He would also discuss some issues related to specific GIS statements. The first thing to be considered is that these documents come from a variety of sources. They are mostly on paper. They consist of reports, letters, contracts, deeds, easements, maps, etc., and they exist in file cabinets and map cases in the parks, the Phoenix Office, etc. There are a lot of them. There are also spreadsheets that staff know about and have been working with. There are FileMaker Pro databases; there is information that right now only resides in the heads of employees. In order to make PAMS a functioning system, staff need to figure out a way to get that information and make it accessible.

Mr. Savage noted that the first thing staff have to do is to locate where these documents are. Staff estimate that there are 100,000 files and pieces of paper out there that they have to deal with. Once all of that information is located, it must be scanned. Staff are talking about creating a library. The locating and scanning part of this task is analogous to buying books from Amazon.com, removing it from the box, and placing it on a shelf in the library. The question is how to find those books again. There are 500,000 books in the library – how does one find the book he/she wants. In a real library, a number is written on spine of the book and entries are made into a card catalogue. Staff must do the digital equivalent of that by taking certain pieces of information about that document and building a kind of card catalogue system for it. Then staff need to create a search and display application that allows that card catalogue information to be searched through in order to retrieve the document wanted when it's wanted.

Mr. Savage noted that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has approximately 7,000 archaeological reports in their library. They range from 2-page-long reports to reports that are 10 volumes in length and take up 4 or 5 feet of shelf space. SHPO staff were foresighted enough to begin building a FileMaker Pro database years ago so that when things were physically placed into the SHPO library they created a record in the FileMaker Pro database so there was something to start with. Staff spent 2 years scanning those documents and then going through the card catalogue and verifying those things one record at a time making sure that everything worked properly. Staff need to build most of the card catalogues being discussed essentially from scratch. Staff

need to go out and figure out what each document is and then figure out exactly how to assign it. That's the most difficult process. The scanning and filing of something on the server does not take a great deal of time. Building that connection between the user and the document will take a while.

Mr. Savage added that, from that SHPO library system, a library query application was built that allows the users of the SHPO library to go in and enter information into a form in order to search for a report through the library. Once the report comes up, the user can read through the report and print whatever pages are needed. It took 2 years to put the whole thing together.

Mr. Savage discussed a couple of issues related to GIS data collection and use. Regarding park boundaries, staff do not know where the park boundaries are from a GIS perspective. Obviously, someone in the parks knows where the park boundaries are. The GIS staff don't really know exactly where those park boundaries are. They also have to deal with a situation that the data they will use to build PAMS, in some cases, is of different quality depending on what part of the state it happens to be in. It will affect different parks differently. He referred to an aerial photograph of Jerome. One can see the actual park in the middle of the picture. The outline shows where GIS claims the park boundary actually is. None of the parks have been surveyed with the end view of creating a GIS layer. A lot of the park boundaries are descriptions and were never actually turned into a map that could be scanned. There is a lot of work to do on this. Staff will probably have to hire licensed surveyors to do this work in order to have that park boundary layer to have legal authority.

Mr. Porter asked how that relates to the actual legal documentation of the agency's ownership and control. He asked if that suggests that some of the legal descriptions have errors in them.

Mr. Savage responded that he doesn't really think it does. What it really says at this point is that that park's boundary layer was constructed on an ad hoc basis. In many cases some of the individual parks look like they were just eye-balled in based on drawings from some document. He also believes that the various park boundaries in that one layer were assembled in a variety of different ways because some are more accurate than others. Obviously, Jerome is the most egregious example. The Red Rock report boundary may have required a little tweaking. It must be understood that when looking at a map of this scale, the boundary lines on the map, because of the way it is printed, it 100' wide.

Ms. Stewart stated that she understood that, but from the standpoint of what the Board wants to use it for, it's not to establish boundaries. They are already established. The Board really wants to know about the vegetation and the terrain. She doesn't think that has to be that exact. She doesn't see that it's necessary to go out and hire surveyors. A lot of the GIS information is available through other agencies having already done it. In her experience with land trust, she does not believe it's that difficult to figure out where one is on it. For the Board's purposes, she believes we are making it more complicated than it needs to be.

Mr. Savage responded that, regarding the boundaries, Ms. Stewart may be right. It does indeed depend on how one wants to use that data. If one wanted to construct a boundary so that it had legal status and use it for that purpose, then staff would be

forced to have a licensed surveyor perform a survey. Even if staff went out and did the survey, it wouldn't be legal. For our purposes, he believes staff could take a one-meter accuracy GPS unit and go out and pinpoint the corners of the parks and be plenty accurate enough.

Ms. Stewart asked why we are even discussing having to hire a surveyor.

Mr. Savage responded that there has been some discussion among the committee in terms of the direction they wanted to go in that particular area and how precise that boundary needs to be.

Ms. Stewart stated that the Board would probably like to move faster and that level of precision for what it will be used for is not required. The Board has its legal documents that already establish the boundaries of the parks.

Mr. Savage responded that staff were trying to get some guidance from the Board in terms of exactly how detailed it should be.

Mr. Savage noted that there is a lot of information that will be acquired from other agencies such as the State Land Department. That information is somewhat spotty, depending on what part of the state one is in and what it might be used for. There are two different qualities of soils data for the Sonoita Creek/Patagonia area. The soil information that was collected in the countywide level is more detailed and was based on the old Soil Conservation Service maps. That level of detail exists for 14 of the parks. For the other 15 parks, data is of the quality of the statewide data which has much less detailed information. Staff are in a situation where, with soils, we have to compromise on what it is that we can do unless we can bring in professional guidance and bring in more detailed soils information for the region.

Ms. Stewart stated that even the state map would be a lot more precise than what the agency is operating under now. Depending on the park and what is being considered at that park, it may not be particularly relevant. The Board is not really charged with protecting natural areas and constructing major buildings at the historic parks so soil would not be an issue. That would be the same for various other things. It seems to her that what the Board really wants to do is gather what can reasonably be gathered without breaking the bank and making this a 10-20 year project.

Mr. Savage agreed and noted that one of the primary concerns is what the information is to be used for. That dictates the scale of resolution needed.

Mr. Porter suggested that the committee will find that across-the-board in virtually every category. There will be some parks where something will be very important but not important at other parks.

Mr. Savage responded that the committee found that to be the case. If one looks at vegetation as another example, it is critically important at some parks but not in others. Staff have very good, high-quality information from the Forest Service for some of the parks. For other parks staff have to go back and use vegetation data that's not nearly as detailed.

Mr. Porter noted that there obviously needs to be a value call done on a park-by-park basis on these areas. If the soil is, for example, a critical factor and the best we have is not really up-to-snuff, then it may need to be addressed. He agrees with Ms. Stewart

that PAMS needs to be in put in place with everything possible as quickly as possible and then go back and perform tweaking in order to improve those areas that need it. We have time to do that. He believes that this will certainly be a living process.

Mr. Savage responded that staff agree with the Board that there are different questions and different issues related to different parks that require different levels of data. Staff have a huge amount of data already and he believes we are in a position where we can begin.

Ms. Stewart stated that she believes she recognizes the names of the people involved in this. She wondered if it wouldn't be helpful to have more of our scientists involved because she believes they would be best able to tell us what level of information is needed in order to operate regarding some of these things.

Mr. Savage responded that both of the scientists are on the larger PAMS committee and their input will be utilized. Everyone on the large committee saw this presentation. It is the subcommittee that is conducting the presentation.

Mr. Warriner discussed developing the data input process, including system maintenance. The first thing staff needs to do is look under every rock and move aside every piece of old furniture to locate and collect and input all existing data into the system. This is a huge task. He can't say that loud enough or long enough. They believe that staff will see the value in this and understand down-the-road how important this will be for the agency. He believes there will be 100% participation on this project. That will be the key to making this project a success.

Mr. Warriner stated that once everything we have is input into the system, the next huge task that will impact pretty much how everybody will do their job will be to document each significant change or event in each park. Staff will have to re-evaluate how they do their work. We have a standard library but not a dynamic information system. The card catalogue described earlier will be verified in terms of data integrity and system compatibility to the greatest extent possible. Staff realize that some of this information will have to be modified so as to bring it into our system. There will be some major work there.

Mr. Warriner described the plan of action. The database has been discussed. Staff will use the whole large community to flush out and discover and identify all the necessary data fields that will be needed to develop the database structure. Staff believes that a pilot project needs to be done to gather the PAMS system use structure data. Staff need a pilot to gauge the scope of work necessary to acquire infrastructure data and to use as a basis to estimate the timeline for the overall PAMS project/process. Staff have identified and chosen Lost Dutchman as the in-house test case. It is an average park in a lot of ways. Because the test case will be done with in-house personnel, it is geographically-available to the Phoenix staff and to most others who will be assisting with the actual data collection work. A GPS receiver will be used to identify park boundaries, locations of buildings, and other park facilities. Once the infrastructure has been tackled, then staff will work on the natural and cultural databases. Staff will gather and input specific data, update, and add new data as it becomes available. Staff will also develop links to other agencies (Game & Fish, Forest Service, etc.) that can provide the types of information that will help staff manage the system.

Mr. Porter stated that he suspects staff will discover that there is a radically different process going on in this whole PAMS project between many of the historic parks and parks like Lost Dutchman. He wondered if it might not be a good idea to do two pilots. While Lost Dutchman is ideal, perhaps one of the historic parks such as McFarland or Riordan should be a pilot as well because there will be a whole different series of issues.

Mr. Warriner responded that PAMS has already had this discussion. He's not sure that they reached a decision yet. There was a proposal to do two parks or to consider the ramifications of the historical parks and try to incorporate them into the model.

Mr. Porter stated that it strikes him that the end result will be radically different.

Ms. Stewart noted that some will and some won't.

Mr. Porter stated that he suspects that certain of the historic parks will be a lot easier to put this in place on. He's not sure what kind of problem the artifacts will be. Staff need to be aware of that early on so they aren't surprised later. He believes it will be interesting to see if there are certain of these parks that can't be brought on along with this and make it that much quicker.

Mr. Warriner stated that once staff develop the cultural databases and the natural databases they will look at the collections that are out in the parks. Staff will scan existing documents, maps, and descriptive metadata into the system. That's, once again, a huge task.

Ms. Stewart stated that it seemed to her that on the first slide there were a lot of things such as roads which are helpful to know about but with the Board's new focus about really trying to emphasize the management and protection of the natural and cultural resources she is concerned that we get bogged down in trying to do too many things at once. It seems to her that we need to line up those natural and cultural resources first. Some of those things are obvious. Yes, it's very nice to have the documentation in the system. But on some of the other things in the natural resources we simply do not have them in any usable form at the current time.

Mr. Porter added that if staff have not gotten the impression yet, the Board really wants to get this thing moving and to see some results as soon as possible. He feels that this will be a continuing building process. It's like building a house. He would like to see some of these aspects going into place fairly soon rather than trying to do this perfect project with all of the parks, or half, or a third in place. He would rather see this project going as quickly as possible. Once the structure is there, if people go into it to look at topographics, for example, on a park and find that information is not there, they will find five other categories where the information is there. Somewhere down-the-road topographics is ready and goes in. The next time they go into the system topographics is there. He would like to see it start getting built and see some structure going up. He would like to get beyond the planning stage, where it appears we still are.

Ms. Stewart added that it seems staff are way beyond what the Board had in mind. She doesn't mind that so much except that she knows the next thing is going to be that we don't have the money or staff available. She would put the emphasis on what is available now has to be on the stuff we will get the most bang for the buck.



Dr. Toomey responded that he is highly in favor of all of this. From his standpoint as a natural resource person, some of the first things he needs are the roads, buildings, and things like the infrastructure just because the Forest Service has vegetation. Their soil maps are out there. One of the major things that slowed staff down in doing the Red Rock report was that staff built all of the infrastructure from scratch from digitizing aerial photos, from GPS, etc. From a resource management standpoint, we need a lot of monitoring of some of this database stuff. One of the first priorities is getting this infrastructure so staff can know how it even relates to other databases that exist out there and then improve our knowledge of our own resources and get them in as well.

Mr. Travous stated that he fears the Board may feel Exec Staff are slowing this project down. The fact of the matter is that it is this group of people who are telling Exec Staff what they need. One of the PAMS members said that, as beautiful as that Red Rock map was, if it didn't answer the questions they had then staff had to go back to scratch and try to do it all over again. If we build these databases and start with what we know and do those parks first, then, while we may never build a report, if we needed to we could.

Mr. Porter responded that the Red Rock report was beautiful. It was spectacular. But he wants it to be available if we want it for all the state parks. It is important that the ability to do it is in the computer system. Staff need to figure out what the base elements they need are to get started and get started.

Ms. Stewart added that she feels that it is not important to have all that information at all the parks; it is important at some parks but other parks can wait longer.

Mr. Travous stated that his point is that this committee is saying this is a great thing. There are some places where we need to go slow in order to go fast. That's what he's hearing. His two main concerns were the process of getting information into the database and then how our equipment will handle it once it's there.

Dr. Toomey noted that there is another concern with the infrastructure. In addition to all the wonderful natural resource analysis, it will also have day-to-day use for park personnel to build maps for groups coming into the park. He believes there will be better Operations personnel buy-in if we can provide them with useful products as well as for Resource Management.

Mr. McNeill reported that early on in the process he tried to get a handle on what the needs are. He is trying to understand what everyone is trying to get out of the system. Compute Support needs to take those menus and turn them into hardware/software solutions. He discussed a few pieces of the puzzle.

Mr. McNeill reported that the first piece of the puzzle is to get what ASP and other agencies have digitized and provide access to that information. It will require a lot of storage. We are talking about at least a terabyte of information – possibly more – to digitize images and photos. Staff need to ask the right questions so not too much is collected sending us in the wrong direction. He acknowledged that staff want to make it quickly available.

Mr. McNeill noted that staff do not know if the update process of maintenance (every time someone changes a pipe in the field it will have to be updated) will address the needs. They are asking everyone what they want out of this system. Are we going to

talk about fires? Computer Support needs a list of everything to be included in the system before dedicating energy to developing it.

Mr. McNeill added that if there are going to be presentations and reports (such as the Red Rock report), this system will be the foundation from where those reports are generated.

Mr. Schiavitti noted that this is not an Internet system; it is local to the parks and park employees rather than the public. It is an in-house system. It will be a delivery system by which all the daily information we gather through PAMS gets to park staff for their use. There are different areas (Collections, Cultural, Infrastructure, Natural Areas, etc.). Each of these categories will take the user on to other menus. It is not enough to have images up there if they can't access them. He briefly went through the various areas and discussed what might be found in each.

Ms. Stewart asked if this would be made available to the public.

Mr. McNeill responded that it is only available to the parks right now. It could be made available to the public.

Mr. Porter stated that another issue will be how much to make available to the public. There may be some aspects that really are internal and not for the public's use.

Mr. Eatherly thanked the subcommittee. They really did a lot of work on this. This is one of the most exciting projects he's been involved with. He is one of the least computer-literate person on the committee. He is really excited because he has gone through very old files, and looked at legal documents trying to find maps from the past. How wonderful it will be to have them in the system.

Mr. Porter stated that he wanted to be sure staff understands that they wouldn't be receiving this kind of intense interrogation if the Board did not recognize how important it is and were not so anxious about it. He really believes that what this committee is doing is one of the most important things the agency is doing. It is just so exciting. He liked what the committee presented.

Mr. Eatherly noted that they needed a data resource manager or someone to help them with this information collection. Everyone on the committee has a full-time job. He thanked the members of the committee – they have been wonderful. The subcommittee has done a lot of work. They are excited about this project.

Ms. Stewart stated that the Board is excited about it, too. She believes that there are two parts to the Board's new direction. One is to be the best resource management agency but the other is for the Board to base its decisions on scientific and factual information. The only way to have good management is by getting the information.

Mr. Porter added that if the Board's goal to become that is realized in any way it may well come through this project. He can see one of the aspects of measuring whether we are the best is if there are other agencies and other states looking at what we've done and deciding that they need to do it, too. He believes the members of this committee are working on a project and process that ultimately may very well become a pattern or model for many other states. He believes that many states are not even beginning to think in these terms. If we establish such a process it will be something that can be exported and place ourselves in the forefront.

Ms. Stewart asked if other states are doing anything like this. She would think that many of the other states do at least have the GIS information available.

Mr. Travous responded that other states are talking about it. Florida has a natural resource program where they use old photos to try to see what was there 100 years ago. Michigan is doing some things. Oregon and Missouri are doing something, but it's more based on management and operations of facilities than on resources.

Ms. Stewart suggested looking into whether California is doing anything. If they are, we could benefit from things that have worked or haven't worked for them.

Mr. Travous thanked Mr. Eatherly for his efforts in this project. Mr. Eatherly stepped in when Ms. Emery left the organization and kept this effort moving forward. He announced that Mr. Dan Shein will be Ms. Emery's replacement. Mr. Shein was a researcher for the House Natural Resources Committee for years. He will join the agency on December 1.

### **3. Discussion of the Conservation Department White Paper**

Mr. Travous noted that at TTC he challenged the employees at to give him ideas on becoming a conservation-oriented organization. He may have inadvertently temporarily changed the Mission Statement of the Board by calling it "conservation" rather than "resource management". The fact of the matter is that he received more than 100 letters from staff talking about this mission; they are excited about it. They have ideas of where we can get the word out and what we can do internally. Some ideas are as simple as putting up a little sign saying, "water doesn't get colder if you let it run" which would aimed at those people from Minnesota who come down here and let the water run expecting it to get cold.

Mr. Travous added that the feedback from the field runs from, "this is the greatest thing since sliced bread" to, "we are being arrogant thinking we can do this". There are some skeptics out there; out intent is to show them.

Mr. Travous reported that the Board received the Conservation Department White Paper at the last Board meeting. There was supposed to be a discussion with the Governor next Wednesday. Because of her surgery, that meeting has been postponed to January 3. Mr. Hays will accompany him to meet with the Governor; they will report back to the Board at the January meeting. He has heard that there is an energy conservation program out there that will require all agencies to reduce energy consumption by 5%. It will require the agency to dig deeper into our pockets than other agencies.

Ms. Stewart noted that there are \$9,000 grants available from SRP. Something could be done with that amount of money at individual parks.

Mr. Travous noted that Buckskin State Park could be absolutely solar. It is small enough and contained enough to go solar. There are a variety of things that could be done throughout the system.

Ms. Stewart voiced her concern about going forward with changing into a conservation agency. She believes that the word "conservation" is not a popular term with the current legislature. She believes the Board runs a very great risk of having the agency folded into something else and being less than what it is now. Timing is everything on

something like that. She is very concerned based on comments she has heard when attending legislative committee meetings. There is a new committee that is looking at efficiency in government and consolidation.

Chairman Hays noted that it would be very difficult to fold this agency into another agency. They may attempt it.

Ms. Stewart responded that they could make us part of the Land Department or Game and Fish. There are a number of things that could happen. They don't think the same way the Board does.

Ms. Stewart stated her concern with us going to the Governor's Office exploring this when the Board hasn't really discussed whether or not to go that direction. It seems to her that it is backwards. The Board should first decide if it wants to do something. If the Board thinks it's a good idea then go to see if the Governor is willing. She believes it puts the Board in an awkward position if the Governor thinks it's a good idea and offers to help and then the Board comes back and say they don't really want to do it.

Mr. Travous responded that he believes the Board has already said it wants to be the best natural resources agency. That's what staff is pushing for.

Mr. Porter stated that he, too, believes it could be much broader. He is not prepared to say that is where he wants to go. He doesn't have as much hesitation at this point. It did strike him that it would be a quantum step further. It is a quantum step he may be willing to take. But at the same time, the Board has not yet signed onto the shift from the best resources management agency to being a "conservation" agency. That decision is still to be made.

Ms. Stewart stated that she sees being the best conservation agency as being much narrower than being the best resource management agency. The Board has a variety of resources that it manages.

Mr. Porter advised care. This is Arizona.

Ms. Stewart noted that the Superstition Area Land Trust took the word "conservation" out of its mission statement during this past year simply because it was felt that a lot of people in this state associated the word "conservation" with things they didn't want to be associated with such as environmental extremists. The word "preservation", even though it is an older term, was thought to be safer in terms of fundraising. She believes the Board needs to be aware that there are populations in this state that feel we shouldn't really be spending money on conservation.

Chairman Hays stated that he believes at this point there is a need to talk to the staff in the Governor's Office to see what their feelings are on the Board's mission and what we're doing. It is by no means asking them to push it. It is to find out what their feelings are. What is being expressed here today will be discussed with them.

Ms. Stewart stated that she has absolutely no problem with talking to the Governor about being the best resource management agency. She does think that talking about being a conservation agency and changing our name is a completely different thing. She thinks it has different pitfalls. We already are, by law, a resource management agency. We are charged in the statute with managing the resources.

Chairman Hays suggested that rather than being recognized as just maintaining parks we should be recognized as something else. The agency does a lot more than just maintain parks. He asked how it would best be expressed.

Mr. Porter suggested avoiding stressing the word "conservation".

Chairman Hays suggested talking to them to see what their concept is of our role and what we are achieving. He doesn't know that they are really aware of all that is being done at ASP.

#### **4. Proposed Board Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2005**

Mr. Travous reported that the Board Meeting schedule for 2005 is included in the Board Packet.

Chairman Hays stated his pleasure with the schedule.

Ms. Stewart stated that she looked at where the Board had been in the last few years and chose some places that the Board had not been. She stated that she believed the Board needed to go back to beginning at 9:00 a.m.

#### **Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move adoption of the proposed Board Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2005.

Mr. Beechum seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Because the Board was about to lose it quorum, it was agreed to take only the remaining Agenda Items that were necessary to discuss at this meeting and to table the remaining items until the January meeting.

Ms. Hernbrode stated she did not believe the Board needed to go into Executive Session.

### **I. PARKS**

#### **1. Section Report**

##### **Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation**

Ms. Hernbrode reported that we still do not have a Judgment. Nothing further has happened.

### **K. FRIENDS RAISING/FUNDRAISING**

#### **Section Report**

Ms. Hernbrode reported that the Board requested legal advice regarding the interaction between ASP and the Arizona State Parks Foundation (the Foundation). She has been working very closely over the past several months with ASP staff trying to put together a contract between ASP and the Foundation that lays out the boundaries of the relationship and how it will work. That draft contract has not been shared with the Foundation yet. It is not in a final enough form to share with the Board yet.

Ms. Hernbrode stated that there have been a lot of discussions with Ms. Statler regarding the legal requirements of the relationship and how the agreement can be tailored to ensure that the lines are firmly in place.

Ms. Stewart asked what the Board can and cannot do.

Ms. Hernbrode responded that the Board does not want to intertwine the two entities so closely that people think they are one entity or that they think ASP is using the Foundation to avoid the laws that apply to it. There are no hard-and-fast lines. There are a lot of factors that courts have looked at. The Executive Director sits on the Board of the Foundation; that brings the organizations closer. The Foundation pays every time they use an ASP facility; that moves the organizations farther apart. We have to try to balance the things that need to be close with the things that need to be kept further away.

Ms. Stewart stated that one of the issues the Board is concerned in knowing about is, for instance, the Board pays Ms. Statler's salary. What is she permitted to do and not permitted to do in terms of being involved with the Foundation. At one time the Foundation listed her as "staff". That is something from the public's perspective the Board will want to make sure we don't cross the line on.

Ms. Hernbrode responded that at this point we are looking at Ms. Statler's not being staff for the Foundation. What she does is liaise between the Foundation and ASP. She helps ensure that the information that ASP wants the Foundation to have is conveyed, and vice versa. Staff looked at the agreements the universities have with their foundations and how they were set up. The UA, for instance, goes so far as having staff they pay working on their foundations. Staff erred on the side of caution. The draft agreement has not been built with the Foundation. Staff are building the agreement and then they will show it to the Foundation and say this is what is required and ask them if they want to work with that and listen to their suggestions for changes.

Ms. Hernbrode stated that she feels very comfortable with the relationship. She does not believe that staff have their ideas for the relationship tied down enough for her to give the Board legal advice. She believes she will be able to do that at the January meeting. Between now and then she believes there will be a working draft of the agreement that she can share with the Board so the Board can provide feedback to staff.

Ms. Stewart stated that she thought before the Foundation becomes broadly known to the public the Board needs to know what the boundaries are in case anyone asks them questions about the relationship.

Ms. Hernbrode responded that it is a practical relationship. The formal piece of paper that says how they will work together will help separate the organizations.

## **I. PARKS**

### Update on Rio Rico/Sonoita Creek Land Acquisitions

Mr. Ream reported that a meeting was held yesterday with Lee Storey and Guy Tobin regarding Rio Rico/Sonoita Creek acquisitions. They provided ASP with a sales contract staff did not like and that was unworkable through the Attorney General's Office. On Monday staff received a copy of that sales contract. He went through the edited copy and found that we were very far apart on how to administer that contract. That contract was discussed at the meeting. As he discussed at the last Board meeting, we are talking about phases of purchase. They want to do far-out phases and bring us in. They want to hold us to those phases; if we don't make certain deadlines we would

have to pay them for not making those deadlines. Another concern staff have is under the Warranty Deed. There a lot of covenants on land that we would hold in fee that are too broad in scope for the way we like to operate properties we hold in fee, such as water rights, how the land is managed, where utility lines run and access to well fields and infrastructure and roads to those places are not specifically identified to create any kind of management plan around them. That's how far apart we are.

Mr. Ream added that staff have embarked on three plans of action over the next month. NAPAC will go back down to the Sonoita Creek/Rio Rico area to look at one of the other properties. One of the first things NAPAC noted from their previous trip was that this place is huge; it is much bigger than we thought. They planned a second trip. Mr. Travous will accompany them to get a sense of what NAPAC feels about this property and to see if we are all on the same page with it. That will go a long way.

Mr. Ream reported that the second plan of action is that Mr. Travous will meet with the Sonoran Institute to discuss a partnership. They have had a long-time interest down there, and he has a connection with the Sonoran Institute. They will discuss the possibility of purchasing the package as a whole rather than trying to phase it in.

Mr. Ream reported that the third plan of attack is that, once Mr. Shein is on board in early December, Ms. Hernbrode, Mr. Shein, Lee Storey, and Jeff Stone will meet to see if some of the gaps can be closed.

Ms. Stewart asked if this is land the Board has already authorized the purchase of or if this is land that requires Board action.

Mr. Ream responded that Board made a motion that staff was to continue to pursue Phases 2, 3, and 4. It is the same property; it's just broken out differently.

Ms. Stewart asked if this was the same property the Board talked about before.

Mr. Ream responded that it is the same property. There is a piece that's new – south of the confluence of Sonoita Creek and the Santa Cruz.

Ms. Stewart asked if that property requires Board action.

Mr. Ream responded that in Mr. Porter's motion staff must bring each phase back to the Board. Nothing will happen before the next Board meeting. Staff have the authority to look at these properties but must bring them back to the Board for approval.

Mr. Travous added that staff have problems with the way it is being packaged.

Ms. Stewart stated that she is trying to find out if the Board really needs to do anything today.

Mr. Ream responded that the Board will hear more in January. Staff hope to move closer on the three issues. He added that Operations has been tasked with what it would take to run this property and how it would be managed. We have not run anything like this with the potential for local and city parks' participation. There are agricultural lands that abut up against subdivisions that would lend themselves more to county, city, or regional parks (i.e., soccer fields). We will not be able to do it ourselves. We don't have \$10 million, and that's the current price tag.

Ms. Stewart asked if staff will have information at the next Board meeting on how much money we have. The Board will be talking about the stuff in Verde Valley and Sonoita Creek. It's one thing to go out to these properties and say how great they are, but the Board needs to look at them in terms of where the bank account stands and what other choices may exist.

Mr. Ream responded that he has an extensive acquisitions list that he hesitates to share. Some have already been authorized by the Board; some are opportunities that come our way (SRP's opportunity, the Kelly property).

Ms. Stewart requested staff give an overview of where we're going and what is on the radar.

Mr. Ream responded affirmatively.

Mr. Ream requested that the Patagonia Lake presentation be postponed until January. Things have changed since the presentation was created. New information has been received regarding noise problems.

Mr. Porter noted that everyone needs to recognize that the January Agenda will be packed with a lot of items and be prepared to start the meeting at 9:00 a.m. and be there the whole day.

## **K. FRIENDS RAISING/FUNDRAISING**

### **1. Section Report**

#### Status of Arizona State Parks Foundation

Ms. Statler reported that the Arizona State Parks Foundation has secured 501(c)3 status with the IRS.

## **N. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Hays adjourned the meeting at 3:04 p.m.

\* \* \*

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Arizona State Parks does not discriminate on the basis of a disability regarding admission to public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Nicole Armstrong-Best, (602) 542-7152; or TTY (602) 542-4174. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

SUBMITTED BY:

---

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director

APPROVED BY:

---

John U. Hays, Chairman